THE ENGLISH RISING
IN 1450.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE

PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF STRASSBURG

FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING THE DEGREE

FO DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

GEORGE KRIEHN.

STRASSBURG
PRINTED BY J. H. ED. HEITZ (HEITZ & MÜNDEL)
1892.

Accepted by the Faculty March 12, 1892.

Affectionately dedicated

to my Father.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41542727_0013

My heartfelt thanks are due to my honored teacher, Prof. Dr. Bresslau, to whom I owe a deeper debt of gratitude than I can here express. It was in his historical seminary that this thesis was begun and completed; to his kind advice and suggestions it largely owes whatever of merit it may possess. I am also much indebted to Mr. James Gairdner, who kindly sent me materials which would otherwise have been inaccessible.

CONTENTS.

Page.

Preface 1

CHAPTER I.

The authorities for the rising of 1450. The chroniclers.

1. Gregory's Chronicle. — Who wrote it? 8
2. The Lost London Chronicle 16
3. Three 15th Century Chronicles 22
4. William Worcester 22
5. The Latin Chronicle ed. Giles 23
6. The English Chronicle ed. Davies 24
7. Other chroniclers 26

CHAPTER II.

Documents and modern authorities.

1. Bills preserved by Stowe 29
2. Materials among the patent rolls 34
3. Paston Letters 35
4. Other materials 37
5. Modern authorities 38

CHAPTER III.

Introduction 44

CHAPTER IV.

Causes of the discontent in 1450 50

CHAPTER V.

Page.
Origin of the revolt in Kent 65
Blackheath and Sevenoaks 70
The rising elsewhere 83

CHAPTER VI.

The rebels in London 88
End of Cade's rebellion 99

CHAPTER VII.

Character of the rising of 1450 as compared with 1381 116
Part of the Yorkists 120

APPENDIX.

Chronological investigations 125

PREFACE.

The period of transition from mediaeval to modern times was marked by a series of mighty popular upheavals in Middle and Western Europe. The outbreak of the Jacquerie in France could hardly be restrained by the nobility; a blow given by the lower classes in 1381 settled the question of serfdom in England. The rising of the commons of England in 1450, the Hussite wars in Bohemia and the insurrections of the German peasants at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th centuries, especially in 1524-5, likewise belong to this great series of outbreaks.

Such mighty factors in popular history merit careful investigation and they have, in part, received the attention they deserve. The Jacquerie has obtained an able historian in M. Siméon Luce;[1] the rising in 1381 has been repeatedly treated. Bergenroth has written a very interesting article on the subject in the 2nd volume of Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift;[2] Lechler in his work on Wycliffe[3] has

---

1 S. Luce, Histoire de la Jacquerie. Paris 1859.

2 G. Bergenroth, Der Volksaufstand in England im Jahre 1381. Hist. Zeitsch. II, 51-86. It gives a sketch of the condition of the lower classes from the Saxon times.

3 Gotthard Lechler, Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation, Leipzig 1873. I, 656-65. Compare Pauli, Westminster Review 1854, VI, p. 174.

treated the religious phases of the movement, and Rogers in the 1st volume of his History of Agriculture and Prices,[1] gives us it's economical aspect.

But the rising of 1450 has not been dwelt upon as much as it's predecessor. A number of interesting articles has indeed appeared, but these only enlighten particular phases of the subject and make no attempt to give an exhaustive narrative. Nor do all of these essays come up to the requirements of modern historical criticism. For an unfortunate custom has until of late prevailed in England of relying on what Hall, Holinshed or some other later chronicler said about times, for which we posses their own sources of information and many others besides. Our modern historians, with the single exception of Mr. James Gairdner, have not compared any thing like all the contemporary authorities which have been published. The resources of these original sources have been by no means exhausted. Their chronological contradictions have never been investigated, the causes of the great upheaval have not been thoroughly determined, nor has an attempt been made to ascertain the relations of the rebels to the political parties of the day. The present treatise will try to supply some of these deficiences.

The rising of the people against the English government in 1450 has generally been treated under the head of Cade's rebellion. The movement began in Kent under a captain named Cade and rapidly spread into Sussex and most other parts of England. The insurrections outside of Kent were by no means insignificant, and therefore I prefer to treat all collectively under the title assumed above, notwithstanding the fact, that most of my space will be devoted to the Kent-

---

[1] J. E. Thorold Rogers, A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, Oxford 1866. Vol. I, 79-95.

ish rising. For this was by far the most important part of the movement, and the only one on which we possess ample information.

Contemporaries and old historians regarded Cade's rebellion as a disorganized outbreak of the rabble of Kent under a rascally military adventurer. All people of position and influence held themselves aloof from such a treasonable undertaking, whose design was against law and order. When the rebels were in power, it became evident that their true intent was lawlessness: they began to plunder. So all well-meaning people withdrew from them, and the rest were only too glad to get pardons and go home.

These traditional views have been most admirably portrayed in the second part of Shakespeare's Henry VI.

> "Rebellious hinds, the filth and scum of Kent,
> Mark'd for the gallows", [1]

says Sir Humphrey Stafford, addressing the rebels. A messenger thus describes them and their purposes to the king:

> "His army is a ragged multitude
> Of hinds and peasants, rude and merciless:
> All scholars, lawyers, courtiers, gentlemen,
> They call false caterpillars, and intend their death". [2]

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers", says Dick, the butcher of Ashford. Cade thus exhorts his men:

> "We will not leave one lord, one gentleman:
> Spare none, but such as go in clouted shoon". [3]

Especially was the ludicrous side of the question adapted to the great dramatist's purposes. Cade is not only a rascal,

---

1 Pt. II, act IV, scene II.

2 Act IV, scene IV.

3 Act IV, scene II.

but a buffoon. He causes the clerk of Chatham to be hanged, with his pen and inkhorn about his neck, because this poor fellow cannot affirm his question:

"Dost thou use to write thy name, or hast thou a mark to thyself, like an honest plain-dealing man?" [1] Lord Say is thus arraigned by the captain of Kent: "Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of the realm in erecting a grammar-school, and whereas before, our forefathers had no other books but the score and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used, and contrary to the king, his crown and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill. It will be proved to thy face, that thou hast men about thee, that usually talk of a noun and a verb and such abominable words as no Christian ear can endure to hear, etc". [2]

Of course it would be folly to demand historical accuracy from a great poet, who only confined himself to outlines taken from Hall or Holinshed as far as it suited his dramatical purposes, and who certainly confounded Cade's rebellion with Wat Tyler's.[3] But any one knowing the incalculable influence exercised by Shakespeare on English thought, will excuse the few lines devoted to his descriptions. Nor do I mean to say that the historians of the 16th and the following centuries had quite such extreme and ludicrous views. But they agreed with him in the main, and the traditional accounts were not dispensed with until a patent roll came to light, containing t he names of many of the pardoned rebels. Since this important document was published by Mr. W. D. Cooper in 1866 and 1868, the face of matters has become completely changed.

---

[1] Act IV, scene II.

[2] Act IV, scene VII.

[3] For instance, he lets Cade's men burn the Savoy, John of Gaunts palace which the rebels destroyed in 1389. The insurgents kill all lawyers, nobles and gentlemen, which indeed occured under Tyler, but not under Cade.

It has become evident, that Cade's rebels were not draw from the lower classes alone, but from the middle classes, the gentry and even from the nobility.[1] Far from being a disorderly multitude, they often assumed the character of a regular military levy. Since that time several interesting articles have appeared, the best of which we owe to Mr. James Gairdner. These modern authorities I shall presently notice But first I shall attempt to give the reader a clear idea of such contemporary authorities as we possess.

---

[1] Below p. 117.

THE AUTHORITIES FOR CADE'S REBELLION.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRONICLERS.

The English chroniclers of the 15th century are very different from those of the 13th and 14th. Men initiated in state business no longer occupied themselves with writing history and their place was taken by others of quite a different calibre. The chroniclers of Mathew Paris' school were succeeded by shortsighted annalists, by men, whose horizon seldom extended much beyond their own town or cloister walls. The ancient regnal annals were followed by small chronicles of mere local importance. The sober townsmen began to write history.

It is mainly to such city chroniclers that we owe our knowledge of the rising of 1450. From their counting-houses and shop windows they gazed on this great upheaval as if from afar. Not one of them understood it's true nature, not one had an insight into it's causes. They only noted the outer events, and not even all of these, but merely such as

principally attracted their attention, because they occurred in London. And as Cade's rebellion was that part of the movement which had most to do with London, their accounts are almost exclusively confined to the Kentish insurrection. They leave only stray notices of the others here and there.

But even of such sources we had a scant supply, until of late Mr. Gairdner published his valuable editions of two contemporary authorities, the so-called Gregory's Chronicle and Three 15th Century Chronicles. By comparing three other works, which have never been consulted to any extent on the subject, viz. the Latin Chronicle edited by Mr. Giles, the Grey Friars' and Caxton's Chronicles, we obtain sufficient material to give us a general idea of the events, especially when the state documents with their incontrovertible testimony come to our assistance.

Unfortunately, not very much has been done for the criticism of these authorities. In most cases we do not even know who wrote them. We are seldom told how far the author was in a position to know what he states, or at what time, and under what circumstances and influences he wrote. We are not informed what authorities our chroniclers used, how far they are dependent on each other or on lost sources. In order to supply these missing links, as far as the character of my narrative renders this indispensable, I have perhaps been compelled to devote more space to investigations on the authorities than is consistent with the scope of my work.

1. Gregory's Chronicle. — Who wrote it?

Among the Historical Collections of a London Citizen, published by Mr. James Gairdner for the Camden Society in 1876, is a London authority which the editor has christened Gregory's Chronicle. It is one of those numerous city annals which the 15th century has produced, and is independent of

all other known authorities from the 19th year of Henry VI, which began according to our chronicle with November 6, 1440,[1] until the year 1469, when it abruptly closes, several leaves having been torn out. Throughout the most of this time the account remains strictly contemporary and constitutes a valuable source of information.

No sooner had this work been published than attention was directed to it's interesting account of 1450, the year of Cade's rebellion, which is in many respects quite different from anything we have heretofore had on the subject. Every thing is described vividly and accurately. When the author gives us a date, he tells us the day of the week as well as that of the month, and both always coincide. He describes the march of king Henry's forces through London so minutely, that I must necessarily think he saw them. He takes such an active part against and always shows such contempt for the rebels as only a contemporary, whose feelings were concerned in the matter, could have done. In fine, I cannot escape the conclusion that he must have been in London at that time, an eye-witness of many of the events.[2]

---

1 The author reckons after the city years, which begin with Nov. 6, like all other London chronicles, not after the regnal years of Henry VI, as has been stated (Coll. of a London Citizen vii). In the account of 1450, for instance, he considers the arrival of the duke of York from Ireland as an event of the 28th year of Henry VI, although the 29th regnal year had begun Sept. 1.

2 It is strange that the account of the year preceding Cade's rebellion should be so short and erroneous. »And that same yere was a tretys of trewys taken whyte the Schottys by Mayster Adam Moleyns for iiij yere, that tyme he beyng enbasytor in to Schotlonde, and aftyr that prevy seale, ande thenne i made byschoppe of Chychester, ande with ynne shorte tyme aftyr put to dethe.« Mr. Gairdner has already pointed out the maze of errors contained in this notice: that Moleyns was not an embassador to Scotland in this year, that the truce was only made for six weeks, and that Moleyns was not made privy seal after this, but four years before, ect. (p. vii). However, I do not think that these mistakes can be satisfactorily explained by

But, notwithstanding the excellencies of the narrative, we repeatedly come across statements of a very dubious nature. We should be compelled to accept some of these, if the accepted opinion holds good, that William Gregory mayor of London in 1452, two years after Cade's rebellion wrote them. For Gregory was in a position to know what he was writing about, and so it is a matter of great importance to weigh carefully Mr. Gairdner's able arguments in favour of his authorship.

The record of the 30th year of Henry VI furnishes the basis of these arguments. "An that yere come a legat from the pope of Rome with grete pardon, for that pardon was the grettyste pardon that evyr come to Inglonde from the Conqueste unto thys tyme of my yere, beynge mayre of London."[1] As Gregory was mayor in this 30th year of Henry VI, Mr. Gairdner assumed that he wrote this statement and consequently the chronicle. But he afterwards discovered that Gregory died before the narrative closse.[2] It was evident that some one else must have finished it. Furthermore, Mr. Gairdner believes that the second author began with the year following Gregory's mayorship, the 31st year of Henry VI. In support of this hypothesis he alludes to the fact, that the record of the five or six years immediately following the 30th year of Henry VI is singularly jejune, although these were times of great political excitement, whereas the history of the years just preceding the 30th year is fully given.[3] He also discovered errors in the first part

---

supposing that a line or two dropped out before, 'for iiij yere,' and that Moleyns had been ambassador to Scotland on some former occasion. The notice evidently refers to the truce of 1444. Or could a copyist have taken one part of the account from some former year and another from the 28th?

[1] P. 197.

[2] P. iv.

[3] P. vi.

of the chronicle, which could only be due to a transcriber.[1] And in the fact that the record of the 30th year of Henry VI does not mention the Christian names of the mayor and sheriffs, the editor sees a further proof that Gregory wrote the account of this year. For they are always mentioned in the preceding part. The duties of office did not allow him sufficient time to write a careful record of his own year and finally compelled him to lay down the work unfinished.[2]

Mr. Gairdner's hypothesis, that the chronicle must be the work of two hands, is undoubtedly correct. The latter part bears quite a different character from the former. Up to the 30th year of Henry VI the names of all the civic officers are given in full. We invariably find both the Christian and surnames of the mayor and the two sheriffs, just as if they had been copied from a list. But the record of the 30th year[3] omits the Christian names of all three. From this time on we often find one or more omitted; they seem to have been jotted down from memory. The record of the year of Cade's rebellion — i. e. the 28th Henry VI — is certainly contemporary; the account of the 32nd[4] cannot be so. In speaking of the first battle of St. Albans the author here remarks: "And in that batayle wer slayne the duke of Somersett, the erle of Northehomerlonde, the lorde Clyfforde, with many moo. And the kynge lete alle thys mater be in a dormon a grete

---

1 P. vi.

2 P. v.

3 I cannot agree with the editor (p. v), that the names in this year are entered in an unusual manner. After the 30th year we often find the given names of the mayors omitted, for instance in the 31st, 33rd, 35th, 36th years of Henry IV, and the 9th Edward IV, where they are simply entitled master without any further Christian name. Mr. Gairdner himself has already called attention to the fact, that those of the sheriffs are often omitted.

4 In reality of the 33rd year (1455); the account of the 32nd is omitted altogether.

and a long tyme aftyr, *as ye shalle hyre*, for hyt was noo seson to trete of pesse." Now the author does not give us these promised news till 1458:[1] "There was made a pesse by twyne the duke of Somersett Harry, and the erle of Saulysbury and the erle of Warwycke for the dethe of hys fadyr duke of Somersette, that the duke of Yorke put to dethe at Synt Albonys. And thys tretys was made at Covyntre, in the holy time of Lentyn, by the mene of kyng Harry the VI." This is a conclusive proof that the account of the 32nd year of Henry VI and the part of the chronicle containing it could not have been written before 1458 at the earliest.

Furthermore, it has already been noted by Mr. Gairdner, that the 32nd year is entirely omitted, and that the seven following are all dated one year too soon. This is a mistake which no copyist, but only a man writing from memory could have made. In the first part a year falls out too, but without interrupting the remaining chronology in the least. Besides this, the other copyist's errors made in the first part show conclusively that one single writer could not possibly have been the original author of the whole book.

But did the second author really begin with the 31st year of Henry VI? The method of naming the London officials changes with the 30th year, not with the 31st. Moreover, the account of this 30th year of Henry VI has exactly the same character as those of the following. It is utterly unlike the full record of the years immediately preceding. Its narrative is just as jejune as that of the following years. Not one word is said about the loss of Gascony and Guienne, whereas in 1450 the loss of Normandy is expressly mentioned.[2] We find nothing said of the duke of York's movements about London,

---

[1] P. 203.

[2] P. 189.

of the encounter of his forces with Henry's at Blackheath, of his reconciliation with Somerset in London. These were events of the greatest importance for London, and almost all of them occurred in the immediate vicinity of the capital. We usually find even unimportant city events minutely described.

All internal evidence leads to the conclusion, that the man who finished the chronicle began with the 30th year of Henry VI. If this be the case Gregory, the mayor in this same year, could not possibly have written the record of Cade's insurrection in the 28th year of Henry VI. A careful examination of the latter record confirmed me in my opinion.

Gregory, the lord mayor in 1451-52, must have been an alderman in 1450; he must have been personally acquainted with the London officials for that year. And yet our author calls one of the sheriffs John instead of William Hulin. [1]

A London alderman would have told us more about the important sessions of the city council during Cade's rebellion than our author, who almost entirely ignores them. And when he does tell us about a transaction in which the aldermen took part, lord Say's trial, he tells us a lot of nonsense, which proves conclusively that he could not possibly have been there. [2] Besides this, we also find quite a number of wild and exaggerated statements, [3] whose basis could only be rumours which the author heard, but in no case such a knowledge of events as an alderman must have had.

It is evident that Gregory could not possibly have written our account of Cade's rebellion, both from the nature of the

---

1 In a petition to the privy council this sheriff calls himself William. Privy Council VI, 167.

2 Below p. 98, n 3.

3 I shall note such statements in course of the narrative.

account itself and from the character of the chronicle. He can only have begun with the 30th year of Henry VI. Some third hand must have finished the narrative, if he really wrote the account of the 30th year, for Gregory died before it closes. But I was unable to find the least evidence in favour of this latter hypothesis. I could discover no likely place for a third hand to begin.

Does the account of the 30th year of Henry VI necessarily say that the mayor for that year was the author? 'Unto thys tyme of my year, beyng mayre of London' may as well have been written by a later mayor. It does not necessarily refer to the 30th year, but, as Mr. Gairdner himself remarked, it may allude to the time when the account was written. It only states that the author was mayor of London at the time he wrote the passage. We have only to determine whether the statement was written in 1451-52. If so, Gregory, the mayor for that year, wrote it; if not, it must have been some later mayor.

The first supposition is impossible. For we have already seen that the narrative omits all the important occurrences of the 30th year of Henry VI. How could a contemporary mayor, who certainly must have had an eye for important events, fail to relate every single thing of importance that occurred during his year, in order to tell us about a papal pardon? The record of the 30th year, like that of the years immediately following, must have been written from memory. Those events in that year, which made the most impression on the mind of our pious author, were the great cathedral bells tolling and the long processions of pilgrims going to be confessed.[1] One needs only to compare our narrative with the accounts of the same year in Davies' English Chronicle

[1] P. 197.

or in Nicolas' brief London Chronicle in order to see that it could not possibly have been written in the midst of the events. The account of the year 1451-52 was written by a later mayor than William Gregory. This writer probably finished the chronicle and embodied in his work an earlier London authority, whose independent part extended from the 19th till the 29th year of Henry VI. I have no idea which one of the later mayors our author was, nor could I find the slightest information on the original author of the former part of the chronicle up to the 30th year. I suppose he was some simple London citizen, who saw and heard a great deal, but who was not particularly well informed. He wrote down a good many rumors which he heard, and that too, at a time when London was full of reports of the wildest kind.

One might object to my hypothesis, that both authors of our chronicle knew too much Latin for a London citizen or mayor. Especially does the second one delight in Latin phrases and proverbs.[1] On one occasion he gives his judgement on the Latin of a papal legate.[2] He also quotes Scriptures and certainly appears to have been an exemplary man from a pious point of view. His holy horror of heresy and his pious indignation at the undutiful conduct of the gallants of those days, who, in spite of the pope's anathemas, persisted in wearing shoes with pointed toes, would have satisfied the most exacting inquisitor.[3] All this seems to indicate a clerical author rather than a layman.

But I do not see why a London mayor of the 15th century could not have known something about Latin or have been a pious man. Our authors handwriting is far too

---

1 Pp. 191-2, 197, 203, 220, 235.

2 P. 226.

3 P. 238.

bad for that of a monk; he makes too many mistakes in copying and in spelling.[1] His other literary collections display a taste, which would ill beseem a pious churchman. War and chase play a very important part.[2] Moreover, no one but a mayor of London would have paid so much attention to the mayors as he did in the latter part of his work, when he approaches his own times. In the 4th year of Edward IV he tells in a very detailed manner, how the mayor saved his own and the city's dignity in a minute point of etiquette; in the 6th, that 'the mayr had a pesabylle yere and a plentefulle of alle Goddys goode'; in the 7th, how 'the mayre beryd hys lady and hys scheryffe and hys swyrdeberer.'[3]

And now that we know that the account of Cade's rising was not written by Gregory, but by a person not so well qualified to know every thing he states, we are justified in treating his dubious statements with more reserve than has previously been done. But at the same time we must be very careful not to go to the opposite extreme and underrate his valuable narrative. It is one of the best, if not the very best we have. Even when it's assertions are most exaggerated, we are generally able to discover a grain of truth underlying them.

2. A lost London Chronicle, forming the basis of MS. Cotton. Vitellius, Caxton, Fabyan.

Literature.

Chronicon Regum Angliae in MS. Cottonius Vitellius A XVI, fol. 106a-109a.

William Caxton's Chronicle, ch. XXVI, published at Westminster in 1480 and 1482. A copy of the second edition is to be found in the British museum.

---

[1] Pp. ii, xix-xx.

[2] Pp. i-ij.

[3] Pp. 222-3, 232, 233. This is a further proof of the fact, that his part in the chronicle begins with the 30th year of Henry VI, the author of which was also a mayor.

Robert Fabyan, The new Chronicles of England and France, ed H. Ellis, Lond. 1811.

The Chronicon Regum Angliae, a part of MS. Cotton. Vitelliùs, contains an account of Cade's rising which was probably written in London, to judge from the prominence given to all city events. Although the chronicle extends in the same hand till 1503[1], at which time it seems to have been written, it nevertheless maintains the character of a first hand authority for the 15th century, beginning with the 19th year of Henry VI, from which point it seems to have faithfully copied some lost London authority.[2]

William Caxton (1422-91), the man who introduced the art of printing into England, was a personage to whom English prose is deeply indebted. In addition to his other literary productions, he also wrote a chronicle containing England's history from 1360 down to his own times, which he published as the 8th book of his edition of Higden-Trevisa's Polychronicon. For the greater part of this work he simply copied older authorities; for 1450, the year of Cade's rising, he could not possibly have an account of his own to give, as he was absent from England as governor of the English colony at Bruges.

Robert Fabyan presents us the rare spectacle of a London alderman of the latter half of the 15th century with literary tastes. In 1502 he withdrew himself from public affairs, because he did not want to become mayor, and from that time until his death in 1512, he appears to have devoted himself to literary pursuits. I dare say it was in this time that he wrote his chronicles, which he himself entitled the Concordance of Histories. It appears that he was very careful

---

1 Pauli V, 697. From 1503 till the close (1509) another hand wields the pen.

2 Gregory xx.

in comparing such authorities as he possessed. How he used them we shall presently see.

Any one reading the three above chroniclers' accounts of 1450, must be struck with the great resemblance they bear to one another. They never contradict, they never vary in the subject matter, and, as a rule, agree almost verbatim. A brief comparison of a few passages will serve to show this concordance.

Chr. Regum Angl. 107 a.

Thenne cam to the capteyn the bisshopp of Caunterbury and the duke of Bokyngham and there speke with hym, whom they fond right wise and well avised in his comonyng.

Caxton, ch. 26.

To whome cam th'archebisshop of Caunterbury and the duck of Bokyngham to the Blacketh and spake with hym. And as it was sayde, they fonde hym wytty in his talkyng and his requestys.

Fabyan 623.

In whiche season came unto hym the archebysshop of Caunterbury and the duke of Bukkyngham, with whom they had longe communycacion and fand hym right discrete in his answerys: how be it they could not cause hym to lay downe his people and to submyt hym unto ye kynges grace.

Chr. Regum Angliae 108 a.

The same nyght folowyng the mair, the aldermen with the thrifty comoners of the citee concluded to dryve away the capiten and his oste. Wherfor they sent onto the lord Scalis and to one Mathew Gowgh, a capitayne of Normandy, that they wold that nyght assaile the capitayne and his people.

Caxton, ch. 26.

And the nyght after the mayre of London, the aldermen and the comons of the cyte concluded to dryve awey the capytayne and his hooste, and sente to the lord Scales to the Towr, and to Mathew Gogh, a capytayne of Normandye, that they wolde that nyghte assaylle the capytayne with them of Kente.

Fabyan 625.

Than the mayor and aldermen with the assystence of the worshypful comeners, *seynge this mysse demeanour of the capitayne, in saueguardyng of themself and of the cytie toke their counsaylles* how they myght dryue the capitayne and his adherentes *frome the cytie . . . But yet in aduoydynge of apparent peryll they condiscendyd that they wolde withstande his any more entre into the cytie.* For the perfourmance wherof the mayre sent vnnto the lorde Scalys and Mathewe Gowgh, *than hauyng the Tower in gydynge, and had of theym assent to parfourme the same.*[1]

The basis of the three narratives is evidently the same.[2] The first two have precisely the same substance as Fabyan, who merely adds two new notices at the close. To any one familiar with the habits of the chroniclers of the middle ages, it is clear that such new notices were probably in some original used by the other two, though not so fully as by Fabyan, unless we assume that the latter copied the other two, supplementing them with other notices. But in the following passages the new matter introduced will be found so closely interwoven with the narrative as to render the latter supposition untenable.

Fabyan 624.

And the capitayne, the self same daye, went vnto the hous of Philip Malpas, *draper and alderman*, and robbyd and spoyled his house and tooke thens a great sub-

Chr. Regum Angliae 108 a.

And the same day, before the behedyng of Crowmer, the capteyn with a certeyne . . . with hym went unto Philipp Malpas howse and robbid hym of moche good.

---

1 The italicised words were probably not in the lost authority but give thoughts inferred by Fabyan.

2 Dr. Pauli has already remarked that Vit. and Fabyan often agree literally, but made no attempt to explain the agreement. Engl. Gesch. V, 697.

staunce; *but he was before warnyd and therby conueyed moche of his money and plate or ellis he hadde ben undone.*

Caxton, ch. 26.

And the same day byfore at after none, the capytayne with certayne of his mayne wente to Phelyp Malpas hows and robbyd hym and toke awaye moche goode.

In the second place it is chronologically improbable that the Cotton Manuscript (1503) is indebted to Fabyan (probably 1502—1512). Besides it's narrative is often fuller than his.[1] Nor could it's author be dependent on Caxton for the same reason. Indeed, had Caxton not written earlier, the most natural supposition would be that he had briefly copied it's more extensive account for the greater part of his narrative.

The only remaining conclusion would be that all three used some lost authority, and a careful investigation not only corroborated this opinion, but revealed just when and where this unknown source was used. It's account of Cade's rebellion up to the battle of Sevenoaks seems to have been more fully copied by Caxton and Fabyan, who exactly coincide, as a rule, although I found conclusive evidence that the Chronicon Regum Angliae must have used the lost chronicle too.[2] After the battle of Sevenoaks all three coincide. Caxton and the manuscript usually agree word for word. Fabyan always gives the same facts and often the very

[1] For instance, it's description of the insurrection in the king's army after the battle of Sevenoaks.

[2] Like Fabyan it lets the rising begin in June. It's description of king Henry's march to Blackheath is identical with Caxton's, its statement, that the council agreed to send the Staffords against Cade, coincides verbatim with Fabyan's.

same words as one or both of the others. Indeed, their concordance is so exact, that I hardly think that any of them used any other source but our lost authority, except perhaps Fabyan, who may have supplemented his detailed account with a notice or two.[1]

From the wealth of information given us by the Cotton Manuscript, Caxton and Fabyan, it is evident that our unknown author's account of Cade's rising must have been very detailed and exceedingly valuable; but, although it's loss is justly to be deplored, we are able to supply it's place in part by that which has been preserved by the chroniclers, who have used it. Beyond this, I can give no information about this lost account, except that it must have been a London chronicle, to judge from the accounts given by it's copyists, and that it must have been written a short time after 1450, not amidst the events themselves. For, as we shall afterwards see, the author has dated all the London events one day too soon, which is evidently a mistake of memory.

The Chronicon Regum Angliae, Caxton and Fabyan are valuable to us according to the faithfulness with which they used this unknown source, and if this criterion be accepted, we must certainly bestow the palm on the first named authority. It's author makes absolutely no pretensions to writing good English, but simply copies what he sees before him, as can plainly be seen by a comparison with Caxton, who also copied faithfully, and whose account agrees almost word for word with our manuscript. But Caxton unluckily contented himself with a short record and omits very much, whereas Fabyan, although his narrative is the most detailed and the longest of the three, is not equally reliable. He has a habit of improving his source's style and diction

---

1 I shall discuss such notices in course of the narrative.

and of airing his own thoughts and convictions.[1] Luckily these expatiations can be easily distinguished from his authority's statements; at any rate, we must be a little cautious in dealing with his assertions. We cannot trust him as we trust the less brilliant, but more reliable accounts of the Cotton Manuscript and of Caxton.

3. Three 15th Century Chronicles is the title of a book edited by Mr. Gairdner for the Camden Society in 1880, and containing three separate English chronicles. No. 3, the relation with which we have to do, is a brief London chronicle. It indeed begins with the reign of Richard I, after the fashion of such city annals, but does not become an independent authority till 1450.[2] From this date until 1464, when the chronicle closes, it maintains the character of a contemporary, and as far as I could ascertain, of a very reliable authority. Especially is this the case with the account of Cade's rising, where we find many facts not recorded elsewhere. Of the author nothing is known.

4. William Worcester,[3] whose annals have been published by Hearne in the 2nd volume of his Liber Niger Scaccarii,[4] was borne at Bristol in the year 1415. He studied at Oxford at the expense of the famous warrior Sir John Fastolf, and afterwards entered his patron's services as a kind of secretary. Fastolf seems to have kept his dependents rather busy, but Worcester still found time to indulge his literary tastes. He collected information on many heterogeneous subjects, such as medicine, astrology, heraldy, history, literature.

---

[1] Compare the second series of parallel passages, above, p. 26, n. 1.

[2] Three 15th Century Chrs. v.

[3] He also calls himself Botoner after his mother. Compare Gairdner's Paston Letters I, cxiii.

[4] Thomas Hearne, Liber Niger Scaccarii, London 1774.

Of course such a learned man used the Latin language in giving to the world the results of his historical studies. His annals seem to have been written from diligently collected notices. Wherever the author's information was deficient, we find him leaving blank spaces instead of dates or facts, and although his annals are, on the whole, rather meagre, Worcester is a reliable authority for the 15th century, especially for the wars of the roses, where he sided with York. As published by Hearne the annals close with 1468, although their author is said to have lived till 1480. From his habit of dating after the London year, which begins with November 6, it would seem that he wrote in London.

His account of Cade's rebellion is brief, but very exact, especially in matters of chronology. His sober statements are an invaluable test for the more impassioned assertions of such chroniclers as the so-called Gregory.

5. The sketch of Cade's insurrection given in the Latin chronicle edited by Mr. Giles,[1] is especially valuable, as the unknown author occasionally drops hints which give us an insight into the causes of events. It is certainly a contemporary narrative and appears to have been written outside of the capital. City events are described much more cursory than elsewhere. Mistakes occur in the names of places near London. Then too, the form of the narrative is not that of a city chronicle, the names of the mayor and of the sheriffs not being mentioned. Indeed, the eulogising legend told about the martyrdom of the bishop of Salisbury, who was most unpopular amongst laymen, as well as the Latin, in which the

1 Incerti scriptoris chronicon Angliae de regnis trium regum Henrici IV, Henrici V et Henrici VI ed. J. A. Giles. The work is no longer to be had in the booktrade, but a copy exists in the British museum. I am indebted to the kindness of the lord bishop of Oxford (Prof. Stubbs) for the knowledge of it's existence.

chronicle is written, seem to indicate that a monk or a priest wrote the work.

6. The English chronicle edited by the Rev. John Silvester Davies,[1] which extends from 1377 till 1461, is not a London chronicle, but one which dates after the regnal years of the kings of England. It is evident from the context[2] that this work, or, at least, the latter part of it, was written before Henry VI's death in 1471. The editor thinks it must have originated in a monastery, either in Malmesbury or in Canterbury. For the author copied a historical work called the Eulogium, which was perhaps written at one of these places. This work, says he, had probably not left it's cloister walls at the time our English Chronicle was written.[3]

I think it very likely that a monk wrote our chronicle. The author was certainly a very pious personage. But I do not think that we can assign him to either of these monasteries. It is by no means certain that the Eulogium was written in one or the other. The Malmesbury hypothesis is founded on a mere supposition of Leland's who lived 1506-52,[4] the other on a statement of Cain's (1568). Besides this, I do not see why the Eulogium which ends with 1413,[4] cannot have left its cloister-walls before our chronicle which ceases in 1461, was written. True, only two manuscripts of the for-

---

[1] An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI., written before the year 1471, ed. Davies, Camd. Soc. 1851.

[2] P. 99 we find it stated that the crown of England hād been usurpated by 'Harry the iiij^{the}, the v^{the} and kyng Harry the vj^{the}, *that now ys in to thys tyme*'. This would confine the date of this part of the narrative between October 1469, where this statement belongs, and 1471, when Henry VI was murdered, not necessarily between the accession of Edward IV in 1461 and 1471, as the editor insists, p. viii.

[3] Pp. xii-xiv.

[4] Ib. xii.

mer work have survived, which seems to indicate that it was never multiplied. But why could not a copy have been lost?

There is, indeed, one argument that speaks for Canterbury as our chronicle's home. In the record of 1460[1] the author gives an exact copy of a ballad which was tacked on the gates of that city. This would lead us to suppose that he had been there and seen it himself.

I cannot say who wrote the account of 1460, but this I can say: the account our annalist gives of Cade's rebellion was not written in Canterbury, the capital of Kent. Not one word is said about most of the important events that occurred in Kent, about the origin of the revolt, about any of the events previous to the rebels' advance on London. But Canterbury was certainly one of the hotbeds of the insurrection and the scene of the first important outbreak, Thany's rebellion. What he does tell us about Cade's later movements in Kent shows clearly that he knew nothing about them. Could a contemporary Kentish chronicler be so densely ignorant of events, that occurred about him?

Indeed, the only events that are minutely described are those that took place in London. Yet these are portrayed in such confuse manner, that it could not possibly have been written by a contemporary Londoner, even if the form of the chronicle did not forbid such an assumption. The chronological order is often reversed and is ever exceedingly mixed up, just as if the author had jotted down miscellaneous events in the order in which they were told him. I think that this was probably the case; our chronicler wrote his account from hearsay. Among the visitors of the monastery, whsoe tales he heard with open ears, there

---

1 Pp. 91-4.

was perhaps some brother, who had been in London and had seen Cade in his dubious glory. This supposition alone would explain the vividness and the minuteness of his account, the way he mixed up matters, and also the prominence given to London occurences. I can give no positive information about the author of the chronicle; I merely affirm that the account of 1450 seems to have been written in the manner above described. I cannot say whether the man who finished the chronicle wrote this account himself or copied it. But I could find no suitable place between 1450 and 1460 for this new Canterbury chronicler to begin. So I am inclined to believe that the man who wrote the account of Cade's rising, and who certainly did not live in Kent's capital, also wrote the record of 1460 and finished the work. Why could he not have copied this ballad elsewhere than in Canterbury?

At any rate, this unknown author is a valuable authority for Cade's rebellion. He has preserved us many on important notice in his confused account. For he is ever independent of all other extant authorities. Mr. Davies' statement, that his narrative of this part of Henry VI's reign agrees in matter with Caxton's,[1] certainly does not hold good for his account of Cade's rising.

7. The brief account of Cade's insurrection given in the Grey Friar's Chronicle[2] is surely an extract from some first- hand authority. True, the author of this city chronicle, which was part of the registry book of the London Minorites, lived in the latter part of Henry VIII's reign. But his narrative of 1450 is quite unlike any of the others. New facts are mentioned and several important local notices given.

I also consider the brief sketch given in Sir Harris

---

[1] Eng. Chr. xi.

[2] The Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London ed. John Gough Nichols, Camd. Soc. 1852.

Nicolas' London Chronicle [1] an abridgement of some contemporary account. It is short, but very reliable and gives us several new notices.

The Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle,[2] on the other hand, is vague and full of mistakes. I was only able to use it once to corroborate statements of the other chroniclers. It's author did not even know in what year our rebellion occurred. The same mistake was made by the author of the brief Latin note of the occurrences of 1449 published by Mr. Gairdner, Three 15 Century Chronicles, pp. 180-1. In reality he gives us what took place in 1450, and has preserved us one or two new notices.

I was unable to get new information from any of the later chroniclers, except from John Stowe. Hall (1548),[3] Grafton (1562), Holinshed (1577) and Baker (1643) cannot be used as authorities for Cade's rebellion and I think it a great pity that modern historians lay so much stress on their statements. We certainly possess all the sources of information they ever used, or rather misused. Take Hall, for instance, with all his combinations and surmises. His account of Cade's rising is nothing more than an improved edition of Fabyan's plus the opinions of Mr. Hall himself, which, by the by, are usually erroneous, and plus several enlargements, also mainly due to this same gentleman's fertile imagination. Holinshed, in his turn, used Hall and Stowe in pretty much the same manner.

As important sources of information for the affairs of the 15th century in general, there still remain three works to be

---

1 A Chronicle of London from 1089 to 1483 ed. Sir Harris Nicolas, Lond. 1827.

2 Continuatio Historiae Croylandensis, in Rerum Anglicarum Scriptorum Veterum tomo I ed. G. Fulman jussu Joannis Fell, Oxoniae 1684. Dr. Pauli cites the work Fell, Quinque Scriptores (Geschichte von England, vol. V).

3 Edwin Hall's Chronicle ed. Ellis, London 1809.

cited. Firstly, Sir John Fortescue's Governance of England ed. Plummer, Oxford 1886. The opinions of the author on the evils of those days are of great value, because he was the best informed man of his times in such matters. He was chief justice of England in the times of Cade's rising and became lord chancellor and tutor to Henry VI's exiled son, Edward, prince of Wales, in later times.

Secondly, Thomas Gascoigne, Loci e Libro Veritatum ed. J. E. Thorold Rogers, Oxford 1886. Gascoigne was the Jeremiah of the 15th century. According to his views the clergy were the cause of the vices because they were so corrupt, but mainly because they did not preach as much as the pious author thought they ought to do. He indeed comes to speak about the cause of Cade's rising, but unfortunately sees every thing through his clerical reform-spectacles.

Among Thomas Wright's collection of 'Political Poems and Songs' (Lond. 1861) we also find some ballads bearing on the affairs of the 15th century.

CHAPTER II.

DOCUMENTS AND MODERN AUTHORITIES.

1. Bills preserved by Stowe.

John Stowe (1525-1605) was a famous chronicler and antiquarian of the times of queen Elizabeth, a most diligent collector of old manuscripts and documents, of which he himself possessed a large and valuable collection.[1] Fortunately for us, he found a number of documents concerning Cade's rebellion, which he has partly embodied in his Annales[2] and which have thus been preserved us.

Stowe had a great virtue, which his fellow chroniclers of the 16th century did not posses: he copied very exactly, especially when he used documents. I found the sources from which he derived several of his bills, and compared them with his copies.[3] They exactly agreed with one another; in fact, the latter were almost fac-similes of the former. Even of the chronicles he used Stowe gives exact reproductions. We can

---

1 He had the manuscripts of several of our chief authorities, the English Chr., Three 15th Cent. Chrs., MS. Cotton. Vit.

2 John Stowe, Annales of England, Lond. 1592.

3 Compare Davies' Engl. Chr. 86 with Stowe's Annales 665 or Engl. Chr. 100 with Stowe 670.

rest assured that he would never knowingly give us any false information or let his imagination tamper with the contents of his source. Moreover, he worked so carefully that we need have no fear of his being easily deceived in what he states.

He has preserved us four documents appertaining to Cade's rebellion and all four bear every mark of genuineness. The form of each and every one of them is just as it should be. The tone ever varies with the character of the several bills. The subject-matter corresponds in every case with the titles and purposes of the documents and would suit in no other time than in 1450. In no case could I find the slightest clue that might throw suspicion on any part of them. Every thing is just as we should expect and just as it ought to be.

The first of these documents was entitled 'a proclamation made by Jacke Cade, capytayne of the rebelles in Kent, anno 1450' by the author whom Stowe copied.[1] It had lain many years undiscovered in Lambeth library (London), ms. 306, when found by Mr. Gairdner, who published it along with his Three 15th Century Chronicles, pp. 94—99. The manuscript was undoubtedly Stowe's handwriting.[2]

The proclamation is an attempt to justify the rebels in the eyes of the nation. It states the evils which compelled them to rise, and the way they proposed to remedy them;[3]

---

[1] The captain of Kent would have called himself Mortymer, not Cade. The orthography of the title is not Stowe's, but that of the lost source he used.

[2] Sharon Turner in his History of the Middle Ages III, 279 gives us a part of the same document, which he obtained from the Harleian MS. in Oxford. But in this copy the proclamation is not dated. Mr. Turner confounded it with the remonstrance made by the Yorkists in 1450.

[3] Thes be the poyntys, causes and myscheves of gaderynge and assemblynge of us the kynges lege men of Kent, ... the whiche we trust to all myghte God to remedy ... and elles we shall dye there fore. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. p. 94.

it is, in short, their political program. It is dated 4 June. Hence it must have been issued in Kent. The rebels did not arrive at Blackheath till June 10 or 11. We only hear of the 'kynges legemen of Kent'.[3] Had it appeared much later the men of Sussex would also have been mentioned. It was evidently meant for the people at large. The 'kyngys trew legemen' are directly appealed to on page 96. The tone is much more violent than in the bill Cade sent the king. Had the document been intended for Henry VI or his council, there would have been no use in their later embassies to Cade.

Stowe calls the second document he has preserved us[1] Cade's bill of petitions, following the English Chronicle. Our lost London authority, as copied by Fabyan,[2] describes it as 'a bylle of petycions to the kynge and his counsayll', wherein Cade 'shewed what iniuryes and oppressions the poor comons suffred by such as were aboute ye kynge'. By the original author of the bill[3] it was divided into two parts, 'the complaint of the commons of Kent and causes of the assemblie on the Blackheath', and 'the requests by the captaine of the great assemblie in Kent.' It will be seen from these titles that the subject-matter of this bill is akin to that of the proclamation. Indeed, the requests correspond verbatim with a part of the latter document, with the exception of their first article, which is added in a conciliatory tone to the more vehement part extracted from the proclamation. The tone of the whole of this second bill is much milder. It is addressed to the king and his council, and it's two divisions are direct answers to the two demands of the ambassadors sent to Cade

---

1 Annales 631-4.

2 Compare Caxton, ch. 26.

3 Stowe 631.

June 16 or 17, as given by the English Chronicle.[1] I cannot think that such a coincidence is a mere accident. Besides, the king and his council are directly appealed to in the first request, and the evils mentioned are such as only the king could remedy, not the parliament.[2]

A third bill given by Stowe[3] is composed of a safeguard, through which Cade gave his London friend Cooke leave to pass in and out of his camp, and of an order sent through this same Cooke to the strangers in London, to furnish the captain with arms and ready money. It was written shortly after Cade's first arrival at Blackheath, according to the reliable Stowe, who probably got this information from the same source, that gave him the document.[4] This would place it between 10 and 13 June. The style of this bill is very pompous; the captain always speaks of himself as we.

Who wrote Cade's documents? I think that the same

---

[1] Eng. Chr. 65: 'To knowe thair *purpose* and the *cause* of thair insurrection.' Fabyan (p. 622-3) seems to think that the king received the bill at Leicester before June 7. 'He (Cade) brought a great nombre ... vnto the *Black Heth*, *where* he devysed a bylle of petycions to the kynge and his counsayll .... The kynges counsayll, seynge this byll, disalowyd it and counsayled the kynge, whiche by the *vij* daye of *Juny* had gaderid to hym a stronge hoost, to go agayne his rebellys.' But this supposition is impossible. Fabyan says that Cade devised the bill at Blackheath and the rebels did not arrive there until June 10 or.

[2] The statement of the Engl. Chr., that a copy was also sent to the parliament of Westminster, is a mistake For this parliament was prorogued in the spring of year before Easter (Parl. Rolls V, 172), whereas our chronicler thought that it's session continued till the beginning of July, when the king fled from London.

[3] Annales 630-1.

[4] Holinshed (Chronicle III, 632) here allowed himself the privilege of misusing Stowe and lets this document be issued after the battle of Sevenoaks, during Cade's second stay at Blackheath, and Mr. Gairdner (Stevens Dict. VIII, 172, Paston Letters I, iii, n. 2) seems to have followed him. Dr. Döring, a Berlin critic, urged that Cade could not have begun his course with an attempt to plunder innocent strangers. But any one familiar with the relations of the Italians to the Londoners, knows that such an act would rather have pleased than offended the latter. Compare Gregory's Chr., p. 199.

man must have written all three. We have already seen that the requests correspond verbatim with a part of the proclamation, which seems to indicate a common origin, although not necessarily. Then too, the style is the same. We find the same grammatical peculiarities in the proclamation as in both the complaints and the requests. Take, for instance, the use of *and* instead of *which*. In the first article of the former we hear of 'certeyn persones, *and* dayly and nyghtly is about his hynesse', in the 3rd complaint of 'wrongs . . . *and* may not be redressed as law will'. We also find a nominative with an infinitive, where one would naturally expect a conjunctive sentence introduced by that. Compare proc. p. 98, '*the kynge to kepe* theyr londes', with the 1st request, '*he to take* in all his demains.' We also find a similar grammatical error in the 2nd request, 'and other *men to have* the revenues of the crowne', whereas in the corresponding part of the proclamation it was avoided.

It appears probable then, that the same man wrote the proclamation and the articles for the king, and if this be the case, I think that he must have also written the bill sent to Cooke. For I do not deem it at all likely that Cade had a corps of secretaries at his disposal. Besides, the latter document is written in the same stiff legal style as the two former. Who was this unknown author? Our lost London authority indeed states that 'he (i. e. Cade himself) made a bille of petycions to the kyng and hys counsayll',[1] but only means to say that Cade sent the bill. How could it's author have known that Cade wrote the documents himself? We have already seen that he was not contemporary.

One thing is evident: the man who penned these documents had experience in legal matters. He knew how to

---

1 Caxton, ch. 26. Compare Fabyan 622.

frame a bill in the proper legal form. Their contents also show that the author was not uninitiated in politics and that he knew what was failing in England. I hardly think that a military adventurer like Cade had such legal or political acquirements. There were surely some lawyers among the squires and gentlemen who followed Cade. Why could not one of these have devised Cade's documents? Of course it is impossible to say how far the author was influenced by Cade's personal wishes. The captain certainly had something to say in the matter. But, as I before remarked, the form and contents of these bills indicate a jurist as the author.

A fourth document that we owe to Stowe[1] is the copy of the warrant for the arrest of Cade and his fellowship. It is dated July 10 and contains several interesting statements about Cade's life and conduct before and after the rebellion.

2. Materials contained among the Patent Rolls, etc.

A patent roll of the 28th year of Henry VI contains a list of such rebels as received royal pardons for their part in Cade's rising. It contains about 2200 names of the men of Kent and Sussex alone, the former of which were published in Archaeologica Cantiana VII, 233—71, the latter in Sussex Archaeological Collections XVIII, 17—36, both by Mr. W. Durrant Cooper. The pardons of Cade and a few others are dated July 6, those of the remaining insurgents on the 7th. The names of the pardoned must have been hurriedly sent in. We often find the same names repeated. Indeed, the whole proceedings lasted little more than a day.

From the number of pardoned rebels mentioned, it is evident that our list does not contain the names of all that took part, but merely such as it was important for the government to keep in mind. These may have been men of

[1] Annales 637-8.

position, who had property that could be confiscated, or who took leading parts in the rebellion. At the end of most paragraphs we find pardons granted to all others of the hundred not mentioned. In most cases this must refer to the numerous poorer peasantry and labourers. It will be unnecessary to dwell on the importance of this source of information and on the gratitude we owe Mr. Cooper for having published it.

Another patent roll of this same 28th year of Henry VI (part 2. m. 17) contains a royal commission, issued into Kent to try such insurgents as had continued in arms after the rebellion had been quelled. The names of the commissioners have also been published by Mr. Cooper in Sussex Archaeological Collections XVIII, 34, but the list of the persons they tried has hitherto remained undiscovered, notwithstanding the editor's researches.

3. The Paston Letters.

The Paston Letters[1] are an invaluable collection of papers and family correspondence, which have been preserved us by several different generations of the family Paston, resident in Norfolk. They were written by all manner of persons on all kind of subjects, and extend throughout the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII. These missives constitute one of our principal sources of information for the social and political life and manners of the 15th century; but for us they have an especial interest, as a few of them directly concern our rebellion. Foremost among these is a letter from John Payn, a servant of Sir John Fastolf's, to John Paston, the executor of that knight's testament. It is an attempt to obtain from Paston a redress of losses, which the writer claims to have had in 1450, whilst among the Kentish rebels in the services of his master.

---

1 Edited by James Gairdner, Birmingham 1872.

The whole letter is composed of descriptions of the manner in which Payn sustained these losses, usually followed by a careful summing up of his woes in pounds, shillings and pence. Among these are several interesting pictures of the doings of the insurgents, of which a vivid description of their camp at Blackheath especially invites our attention. How far are his statements to be trusted?

In the first place it is a little suspicious, that the letter was not written till 1465, after Fastolf's death. If Payn had rendered such important services as he claims to have done, he certainly would have received some remuneration during his master's lifetime. He asserts that he saved Fastolf's horses from being stolen and that he afterwards prevented his house in Southwark from being burnt, for which loyality he himself was plundered, to say nothing of what he suffered in Kent. "And in Kent there as my wyfe dwellyd, they toke awey all oure godes mevabyll that we had, and there wolde have hongyd my wyfe and v of my chyldren, and lefte her no more gode but her kyrtyll and her smook." Furthermore, in the battle of London bridge he claims to have been "woundyt and hurt nere hand to deth . . . . . and iiij tymes before that tyme I was caryd abougt thorought Kent and Sousex, and ther they wolde have smetyn of my hede."[1] I admit that Fastolf may have heen a miserly individual; but could he have left such services and such sufferings unrewarded?

In the second place, Payn represents himself as having been compelled to go with the rebels, and as having been faithful to the king and to his master Fastolf, whom Cade characterized as 'the grettyst traytor that was in Yngelond or in Fraunce'.[2] But only soon after Cade's rebellion we find

---

[1] Paston Letters I, 134.

[2] Ib. 132.

him engaged in further riots, which certainly had the self-same origin as that famous movement. On 2 November, 1451, he was pardoned for treasonable conduct between July 7, 1450, and June 10, 1451. This shows conclusively that after his pardon along with the other insurgents on July 7, he still persisted in riotous conduct. For this misdemeanor he was afterwards thrown into prison, as he himself tells us. And therefore, I think that his alleged loyality to the king, as well as his services to Fastolf and many of his sufferings on account of the rebels' ill will, are to a large extent mythical. The whole letter is simply a scheme to raise money. All assertions he makes and all descriptions he gives are twisted and exaggerated, perhaps even changed to that end, and each and every one of them are only to be used with the greatest caution.

Among the remaining letters of the Paston Correspondence are several which give us information on the events, which directly preceded and followed Cade's rebellion. One of May 6, 1450, from John Crane to his cousin John Paston,[1] throws some light on the Leicester parliament of that year, another of August 19 from Paston's servant Greshham,[2] gives us a glance at a rising which occurred at that time.

4. Proceedings of the Privy Council, Rolls of Parliament, Rymer's Foedera, Issue Rolls.

The privy council of England was composed of the ministers and such of the lords as the king might choose to summon. It's functions were to advise him on all matters without the pale of the common law, to negotiate loans and

---

[1] Paston Letters I, 136-7.

[2] Ib. 138-40.

to try all petitions addressed to the king. It's power had already become coordinate with the royal under Richard III, and under such a weak ruler as Henry VI it's functions increased still further, as a matter of course. Hence we find many materials for the insurrection of 1450 among it's proceedings.[1]

The Rolls of Parliament contain little which bears directly on our subject, but very much which we cannot afford to slight, if we wish to understand the causes of the rebellion. Especially is this the case with the acts of the 28th year of Henry VI, which began with 1 September, 1449. There were three sessions held in this year, two at the royal palace in Westminster, prorogued December 17 and March 30 respectively, and a third, at Leicester, whose course was interrupted by Cade's rebellion. Unfortunately, the parliamentary acts of this year are not arranged in their chronological order. This makes it difficult to distinguish between the various sessions. Whenever I cite one of these documents, I shall attempt to determine the session in which it was passed.

I also found opportunity to use Rymer's Foedera [2] and the Issue Rolls of the Exchequer [3] on more than one occasion.

5. Modern Authorities.

All students of the rising of 1450 owe an especial debt of gratitude to Mr. James Gairdner, on account of a series of

---

[1] Sir Harris Nicolas, Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, London 1834-7. Vol. VI contains Henry VI's reign.

[2] Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et cujusque generis Acta Publica ed. Thomas Rymer et Georgius Holmes, Hagae Comitis apud Joannem Neaulme, 1741.

[3] F. Devon, Issues of the Exchequer from Henry III till Henry VI, London 1837. Vol. II containe those cited below.

very valuable articles he has written on the subject. The first of these appeared in 1870 in the Fortnightly Review [1] under the title Jack Cade's Rebellion. It is a successful attempt to show how the traditional account has been affected by the researches of Messrs. Orrige and Cooper. Beginning with an interesting description of Shakespeare's ideas of Cade and his followers, he notices the causes which compelled the Kentishmen to rise, and then proceeds to give us a brief account of the rebellion itself. Fabyan and Stowe appear to have been his principal authorities, although Worcester and even Holinshed are occasionally cited.

Mr. Gairdner's second account of Cade's insurrection appeared in 1872 in the introduction to his invaluable edition of the Paston Letters. It is a part of the historical sketch of the times in which these missives were written. The disposition of the subject-matter is similar to that in the former article, a sketch of the causes followed by a narrative of the events. The latter part, however, is far fuller. More contemporary authorities are cited: so, for instance, one of the Three 15th Century Chronicles, the Vitellius MS. and Davies' English Chronicle. The account of the disturbances immediately following Cade's rebellion merits attention, because it contains new information on Parmynter's insurrection. And finally, he gives us a full account of John Payn's dealings with the rebels, in which that Gentleman's statements are all duly accepted.

In the introductions to the editions of Gregory's Chronicle (1876) and Three 15th Century Chronicles (1881) we also find brief sketches of Cade's rebellion, with remarks on the new matter presented, especially in the former. In a like manner,

---

1 New series, vol. VIII, 442-55, not vol. XLVI, as cited in Three 15th Cent. Chrs. v.

there is considerable space devoted to Cade in the able work on Lancaster and York,[1] but the views advanced are the same as in the former treatises.

The latest written by Mr. Gairdner is an article on John Cade in Stephen's Dictionary of National Biography. It contains a short account of Cade's life, based on the statements of the proclamation for his arrest, which are accepted without question, and a description of the insurrection. The latter is noteworthy as being the first account of Cade's rebellion, in which the statements of the so-called Gregory have been used to a full extent. Under the assumption that the mayor of London must have been well informed, Mr. Gairdner bestows great confidence on his assertions, however strange they may seem. One of these, viz. the statement, that there were two captains in Kent instead of one, is duly accepted, and arguments are advanced in it's favour. On the other hand, it is to be noted that the narrative has become more complete through the use of Gregory. Several errors have been avoided.

Mr. W. Durrant Cooper's paper on the Participation of Sussex in Cade's Rising appeared in 1866 in the Sussex Archaeological Collections XVIII, 17—36. After some valuable remarks on the participants he gives us a literal translation of Worcester, by way of an account of the rebellion. The narrative of the occurrences after the rising, in which the fate of Cade's booty is traced, and the commission sent into Kent to try the rebels is described, is based on state papers, which had hitherto not been utilized. The author finally comes to speak of Cade, whom he supposes to have been no lowborn person, and concludes with an account of the mach-

---

[1] The Houses of Lancaster and York, with an account of the Conquest and Loss of France, Lond. 1881, in Edw. Morris' Epochs of Modern History.

inations of his swordbearer Poynings after the rebellion was over.[1]

In 1868 a second paper by Mr. Cooper appeared amongst the Proceedings of the Kent Archaeological Society.[2] It is entitled John Cade's Followers in Kent, and like it's predecessor, also contains some remarks on the character of the rebellion and the professions of the participants. In the narrative of the insurrection given, Worcester, Stowe and the public documents appear to have been the principal authorities used.

The two above articles from the major part of a work called Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion,[3] by the late Mr. B. Brogden Orrige, who added to them a treatise of his own on 'Alderman Philip Malpas and Alderman Sir Thomas Cooke, K. B.', two gentlemen who were intimately connected with Cade's rebellion. This latter treatise contains the results of a search amongst the Guildhall records for information on lord Bacon and his ancestors, to whom Malpas and Cooke happened to belong.

The account of Cade's rising given in Dr. Pauli's History of England[4] is written in the careful, scholarly style peculiar

---

1 The continuation of this article, Mark Anthony Lower's Notes on Cade and his Adherents (Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 37-41), merely gives some genealogical notices on the descendents of Sussex gentry who were among the rebels.

2 Archaeologica Cantiana VII, 233-71.

3 Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion from researches in the Guildhall records, by B. Brogden Orrige; to which are added contributions by W. Durrant Cooper on the Rising of Cade and his Followers in Kent and Sussex; Lond. (John Camden Hotten) 1869. The book is no longer to be had from booksellers, for which reason I prefer to cite Cooper's opinions from the Proceedings of the Kent and Sussex Archaeological Societies, which are to be found in most public libraries of importance. The two papers published exactly correspond with the book, with this exception, that the remarks on Cade's booty, ect. appear under the head of Cade's Followers in Kent in the book.

4 Reinhold Pauli, Geschichte von England, in den Geschichten der europäischen Staaten, hg. v. Heeren und Ukert, Gotha 1858. Vol. V, 306-14.

to German historians, and is a very good one, when we consider how few authorities he had to use. But as he did not posses any of the authorities lately published, he was led to place too much weight on Fabyan. He seldom gives new statements without quoting a good contemporary source. Nevertheless, I found some assertions for which I searched in vain among the authorities. The author also discusses the causes of the rising, on which occasion he quotes many of the opinions of Gascoigne, but without telling us what he thinks of them.

In Mr. Furley's History of the Weald of Kent[1] we find the popular questions, whether Cade was captured in Kent or in Sussex, and whether Iden was sheriff at this time or just after, discussed at great length.

---

[1] Robert Furley, History of the Weald of Kent, Ashford and London 1874. Vol. II, pt. I, 381 sq.

CHAPTER III.

INTRODUCTION.

The deposition of Richard II by Henry of Lancaster in no wise bettered the condition of the English crown. It was a victory of the nobles. Commons and clergy merely acquiesced in the coup d'état. When Henry IV had to look to them for support against the very men who elevated him, he had to give high prices for their good will. These could only be paid at the expense of the crown. Even the union of all elements under Henry V did not succeed in permanently raising the royal power. For it was based on the voluntary support of all parties concerned, and no sooner was the great warrior no more, than the whole structure collapsed. His talented brother, the duke ot Bedford, indeed succeeded in maintaining order for a short time, but when he too died, the same old factions contended for the mastery under the helpless babe, that wore the crown. The one was headed by duke Humphrey of Gloucester, a brother of Henry V, who had named him lord protector of England during his son's minority. This Humphrey was in perpetual conflict with his uncle, cardinal Beaufort, the mainstay of the house of Lancaster, through the great sums of money he was ready to lend. In course of time Gloucester, although heir-presumptive to the

crown, was not only excluded from the council board, but so badly treated that he died. The other party, which was headed by William de la Poole, duke of Suffolk, succeeded in getting the king completely under it's control. It's leader was enabled to dictate England's politics at his will, and to exclude all lords from the council, who did not think just as he did.

But Suffolk unfortunately had bad luck in France, where he advocated a policy of peace. The people, of course, blamed him, instead of Henry V's ambition and their own warlike spirit, which had plunged them into the unequal conflict. All they knew was, that in spite of tenths and fifteenths, province after province was lost. They did not reflect that even the best of generals cannot carry on a war without the necessary support from home. Their hearts turned more and more to the opposition, which was ably headed by Richard, duke of York. Richard was heir presumptive to the throne, provided the claims of the Beauforts[1] were set aside. He had been regent of France, and just after he had been recalled, a series of reverses met the English arms. This threw a halo of glory about him, which was heightened by the success he was reputed to be having in Ireland, where he had been sent as viceroy.

The nobility was slowly grouping itself into the two great factions which were soon to wage the wars of the roses. It was not so much the principles of the parties involved as private interests and pettly local feuds, that caused them to take either side. The crown had not only lost all hold on

[1] The Beauforts were the offspring of John of Gaunt and Catherine Swynford, a mistress, whom he afterwards married. Although their children were legitimized, Henry IV had them excluded from the succession. The question was, whether he had a right to do this. Edmund, duke of Somerset, and at that time regent of France, was the heir of the house. The claims which York at that time openly professed, were inherited from his grandfather, a younger brother of John of Gaunt.

them, but had itself become the tool of party faction. Feuds were settled sword in hand. Judges were bribed or intimidated, juries were packed either through open violence or through royal permission, if one of the contestants happened to belong to the court party.[1] Scores of armed retainers, used to violence and bloodshed from the French wars, followed at the heels of the nobility and fought their battles for them. Every man, who wished to live in safety, was forced to choose or rather purchase himself a lord.[2] For against the nobles the law was powerless.

The spiritual lords were not a whit better than their lay colleagues. Their greed for prebends and benefices was just as disgusting as the contests of the latter for manors. Far from worrying themselves about the moral condition of their flocks, they themselves set the worst possible examples.[3] And as for the king's officers, who were there to execute the law and to protect the people, they were the worst robbers of all.

Such was the state of internal affairs in England, when the news came in the latter part of 1449, that all Normandy had been lost. The humour of the paliament, that met on November 6, can be imagined. But Suffolk was firm and dauntless as ever in face of the raging commons and the powerful enemies among the lords,[4] who had resolved to ruin him. His colleagues began to drop off, one by one. Adam Moleyns, bishop of Chichester, resigned the office of keeper of the privy seal.[5] Stafford, archbishop of Canterbury, laid

---

1 Fortescue, Governance of England, introd. 20.

2 Ib. 23.

3 Rogers' Gascoigne 189. Ecclesiastici destruunt nos, qui bonis suis laute vivunt et nos inedia perimus, et regem destruxerunt vel adulando vel tacendo. Compare ib. 43, where their sins are summed up.

4 Especially lord Cromwell. Worcester 467.

5 Rymer Foedera V, II, 20. 9 Dec. 1449, indulsimus eidem quod pro termino vitae suae . . . ab omni seculari occupationi . . . se abstinere poterit.

down the chancellorship and was succeeded by John Kemp, archbishop of York, with whom Suffolk had never been able to act cordially.[1]

But notwithstanding his resignation, this same Moleyns was the first victim of the popular indignation. On January 9,[2] 1450, he went down to Portsmouth in Kent to pay the wages of the soldiers and sailors, who had been assembled there for the purpose of passing over the sea.[3] They came to his inn[4] to get their pay, but he tried to content them with less than their dues. A quarrel ensued, and the bishop was killed on the spot.[5] Both Moleyns and the mutineers used pretty strong language in the altercation. They are said to have called him a traitor to the king and his country, and to have accused him of having helped to betray Normandy;[6] Moleyns in his retort was reported to have implicated the duke of Suffolk.[7]

Accordingly, the latter was formally impeached of treason by the commons of the parliament, which resumed it's sessions on 22 January, 1450. Suffolk refused to submit to a trial by his peers and threw himself unconditionally on the king's mercy. Henry, in order to save his favourite, sentenced him to five years banishment from the realm of England.

The news of the escape of the national scape-goat so incensed the London populace that they arose, Worcester says

---

[1] Rot. Parl. V, 172 give the date of his resignation, Jan. 31.

[2] Engl. Chron. 64. Compare Worcester 467. *circa* Epiphaniam Domini.

[3] Gregory 189. Moleyns does not appear to have held any office outside of being a member of the privy council.

[4] Worcester 467.

[5] Mr. Gairdner (Past. Lett. I, xliii) has already called attention to the fact, that Moleyns' friend Aeneas Sylvius says he was decapitated (Opera p. 317, Helmstadt 1599). But Sylvius knew very little about English affairs, as any one reading the chapter just cited will see.

[6] Worcester 467.

[7] Rot. Parl. V, 176.

to the number of 2000, and laid in wait about St. Aegidius without Holborn. They hoped to intercept the duke on the way to his estates in Suffolk, but only succeeded in capturing his horse and maltreating several of his servants.

Most intent excitement raged. Riots began to break out in different parts of the country under leaders bearing anonymous names.[1] The most formidable of these occurred at Canterbury, where the leader assumed the character of a hermit, but with the by no means pious name of Bluebeard. The movement was crushed before it could assume formidable proportions, and Bluebeard, who was in reality a fuller named Thomas Cheyny,[2] was taken near Canterbury on February 9. He was soon afterwards hanged and quartered. According to a facetious custom of those days, his head and quarters were sent as mementoes to some of the discontented cities.[3] In this case, however, the old usage met with some opposition, as no one, for fear of their very lives, would venture to convey these relics to their destination, — a very good characteristic of the popular discontent of the times.

Busy hands were at work fostering such outbreaks. On 17 February[4] the privy council found it neceesary to order

---

1 Fabyan. Compare Past. Lett. I, 130-1. "I pray you sende me word who darre be so hardy to keck agen you in my ryght. And sey hem on my half that they shall be qwyt as ferre as law and reson wolle. And yf they wolle not dredde ne obey that, then they shall be qwyt by *Blackberd* or *Whyteberd, that ys to sey, by God or the devyll.*" This letter was written on May 27 by Sir John Fastolf. Mr. Gairdner thinks that Blackberd and Whyteberd may refer to two ringleaders, who formed a trio with *Bluebeard* (Fortn. Review, new series VIII, 466, n. 1). But it is evident from the context that Blackberd and Whyteberd are simply other names for God and the devil.

2 I have adopted the orthography of a contemporary petition — Privy Council VI, 107 — in preference to Fabyan or Stowe 629, who were later

3 Canterbury received the head, London, Norwich and the Cinque Ports the quarters. Privy Council VI, 107.

4 Ib. 90-2.

he mayor and bailiffs of Canterbury, Maidstone, Colchester, Sandwich, Oxford, Winchelsea and Sudbury to suffer no unlawful assemblies to be made in their cities, and to harbour no crowds or gatherings. They are particularly instructed to give no credence to the orders of any person to that effect, of whatsoever rank he might be. Conspirators [1] had sent letters to the municipal authorities "under untrewe, fained and pretense colores of entending to the comune weel of this oure lande, where as God knoweth th'entent of thoo that so labour is to the subversion thereof." The authorities immediately forwarded these missives to the king. From the way in which Bluebeard's remains were distributed, as well as from the cities named in the above order, it is evident that the discontent was very widespread. We hear not only of the southwestern counties, Kent and Sussex, but also of Norwich in the east, and of Oxford in the heart of the country.

The enemies of the government remained ceaselessly active throughout the spring. On 20 February orders had to bet sent to the sheriffs of London, Surrey, Sussex and Kent to prevent all citizens, except those whom the law allowed, from carrying arms. [2] Seditious bills and libels against the ministry were tacked upon the church doors and otherwise circulated, but so secretly and so expeditiously, that it was very difficult to discover the authors. [3] On 4 April the king issued an order commanding the sheriffs of London and Middlesex to prevent such bills being circulated, and to look out for originators of the disturbances.

On 30 April [4] the duke of Suffolk embarked at Ipswich

---

[1] We shall hear more of them later on.

[2] Rymer V, II, 22.

[3] Ib. 24.

[4] Paston Letters I, 124. Worcester 469. The Engl. Chr. 69 says May 3, but the letter to John Paston is strictly contemporary.

for Flanders with two ships and a little spinner. His convoy was met off Dover by several ships, that had been lying in wait for him. The men of the spinner, which had been sent ahead, had betrayed his presence to one of the vessels, called Nicolas of the Tower. Suffolk saw the hopelessness of resistance and went on board of the Nicolas. "Welcome traitor", was the ominous greeting the master gave him. It was all over with the duke. All his men disavowed any intentions of taking his part.[1] He was left to the tender mercies of the master of the Nicolas, who was said to have formally arraigned him on the articles of impeachment made in parliament.[1] On 2 May[2] he was let down into a boat at the side of the ship and clumsily beheaded with the rusty sword of an Irish sailor.[3] His own men looked quietly on.

The news of Suffolk's death was received with approbation by the country at large. Popular ballads praised the deed.[4] People were getting more and more excited. Just at this time the news of the utter defeat of Sir Thomas Kyriel, the last hope of the English in France, broke over the country.[5] The popular excitement was raised almost to frenzy. In Kent, wild rumours were noised about, that the king would surely revenge Suffolk's death on that county.[6] The people rushed to arms and a great insurrection began. But before beginning with the narrative of these events, it will be found expedient to review the more immediate causes of the popular discontent, in order that we may more easily understand the character and the course of the events.

---

1 Paston Letters I, 125.

2 Ib. I, 125. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 66 say on May 1.

3 Engl. Chr. 69.

4 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 99-103.

5 Paston Letters I, 125.

6 Nicolas of the Tower and his comrades were Kentish ships.

CHAPTER IV.

CAUSES OF THE DISCONTENT IN 1450.

Nature herself seems to have paved the way for the great upheaval of 1450. Observing contemporaries did not fail to note the dire natural portents which preceded. The year before, "on Simon day and Jude[1] and other daies before and aftir, the sonne in his risyng and goyng donne apperid as reed as blood, as meny a man saw".[2] An earthquake occurred. What was more important, prices were very high.[3] The high prices of the necessities of life afflicted the people at large, — indeed, Gascoigne[4] says distinctly that the people arose on account of their great poverty. They could not possibly pay such taxes as were demanded in 1450.

The wars begun by Henry V in France had cost enormous sums of money. Great debts had been contracted in order to begin them, and great sums had to be levied in order to carry them on. Every method of raising money had

---

[1] Oct. 28.

[2] Engl. Chr. 63.

[3] Grey Friars' Chr. 19. Hist. Croyland. 526 dates earthquake and rebellion a year too soon.

[4] P. 43.

to be used. All powers of taxation had to be strained to the utmost. The overtaxation resulting from these efforts was one of the principal causes of the rising in 1450.

It may be an exaggeration, when the English Chronicle states that "alle the commune peple, what for taxes and tallages and other oppressions, myght not live be their handwork and husbondrie", but it's author was certainly on the right track. In a petition of the parliament at Leicester,[1] whose course was interrupted by Cade's rebellion, the commons state that they were so impoverished by taxes as to be well nigh destroyed. And the grant of subsidies in the same sessions states: "We youre saide communes, in als humble wyse as we canne or may, pray and beseche yowre highnes, of yowre most habundant grace tenderly to consider the universale poverte and penurie of yowre liege people of this yowre royalme, so that we canne, may ne darr not in eny wyse charge yowre seid people" with the usual grants.[2] The expenses of an English king in times of war have been estimated at £ 155 000,[3] which could only be raised, when the nation was straining itself to the utmost. But England had been involved in the ruinous French wars ever since 1415. It had long been found impossible to raise anything like the requisite sums. The debts of the king and the high medieval rates of interest to be paid on them kept on increasing at such a rate, that in 1450 the former had reached the sum of £ 372 000.[4]

It was found all the more difficult to raise money, as the chief aid of the nation in increasing the revenue had disappeared. The income from the royal domains always formed

---

1 Rot. Parl. V, 183.

2 Ib. 173.

3 Stubbs, Const. Hist. II, 547.

4 Rot. Parl. V, 183.

the nucleus of the money to be raised, and should at least have sufficed for the expenses of the king's household. For the crown was very rich. The revenues of the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall were at it's disposal, and there was scarcely a county in England, where the king had no domains, to say nothing of his possessions in France. But since Henry VI's accession this property had so persistently squandered, that in 1450 only £ 5000 income could be raised from them.[1] Even in 1433 the gross income of the crown was reckoned at £ 34 224 17 *s.* 6 *d.*[2]

Small wonder then, that the first request of the captain of Kent asks the king to resume all his alienated possessions, that his second complaint states that 'the king is stirred to live onely on his commons and other men to have the revenues of the crowne, the which hath caused . . . great paiments of the people, now late to the king granted in his parliament'. Cade's proclamation bitterly denounces the counsellors of the king on this very account.

The Rolls of Parliament are full of petitions on the subject. In most of the sessions preceeding 1450 we find petitions of resumption,[3] but they were either not granted or supplemented with so many provisions as to render them useless. This was the case with such an act passed by the parliament of Leicester in 1450. The first remedy proposed by Fortescue[4] is resumption. Even the clerical Gascoigne[5] is not silent about the alienation of the royal possessions. Moreover, the articles of the rebellious commons under Robin of Redesdale dis-

---

1 Rot. Parl. V, 183.
2 Ib. IV, 433.
3 Ib. IV, 482, 504. V, 63, 103, 110, 139.
4 Governance, chs. X. XI.
5 P. 188.

tinctly name this practice as one of the principal causes of the evils of the reigns of Richard II, Henry VI and Edward IV.[1]

An other source of complaint on the subject of taxation was the wholesale abuse of the royal right of purveyance. This privilege gave the king the right to take the provisions necessary for the support of his household, whilst travelling through the country. He paid no more for them than the mere nominal prices his agents chose to determine. The payments were made in tallies, or certificates on the treasury, but as Henry VI's treasury was usually empty, it's notes were of small avail. "The people . . be not paide of debts owning for stuffe and purveiance taken to the use of the king's household, in undooing of the . . . poor commons of this realme", complains the captain of Kent. Moreover, the purveyors often levied, contributions without the written consent of the king and his council, upon which the tallies were not recognized at the treasury. Cade's 5th request is directed against this malpractice.

The right of purveyance also entitled the king to the use of horses and waggons to convey the court through the country, and even to the compulsory labour of the peasantry. Every man, from the archbishop to the poorest peasant, suffered under the abuses of this right. Parliament had ever protested against and had even compelled Edward III to renounce it.[2]

The commons of Kent complain of the misuse of several other kinds of taxes. The sheriffs unjustly levied hunting taxes on poor people, who did not hunt; under pretense of a writ called enquestes they summoned people into court without due warning, and then got them fined for not appearing;

---

1 Warkworth's Chronicle ed. James Orchard Halliwell, Camd. Soc. 1839, pp. 45-51.

2 Compare Stubbs, Const. Hist. II, 414-5.

they raised more money in collecting certain fines than the writs of the court of the exchequer, which were sealed with green wax,[1] gave them a right to. In the 5th of Cade's requests the latter abuse is described as being falsely used to the perpetual destruction of the king's true commons of Kent.

A second great cause of the public discontent was the misgovernment then prevalent in England. Deducting many accusations against the government as due to party hate, and considering the difficulties with which it had to contend, it yet remains incontrovertible that an inexcusable amount of mismanagement, bribery and extortion was practiced in all circles of the English government, — all of them, from the king's ministers down to his bailiffs.

Especially had the members of the privy council, among whom the ministry was included, drawn almost universal condemnation on their heads. The Parliament Rolls are full of complaints against the management of affairs. The first ten paragraphs of Cade's proclamation consist of tirades against the king's evil advisers; the 2nd and 3rd of his complaints and the greater part of his requests are levelled at them. Let us examine their internal and external policy, beginning with the course pursued in regard to the crown.

In order to meet the great financial needs of the day, all the possessions of the crown should have been carefully hoarded and kept intact. Most rigid economy should have been practiced. But the government of Henry VI pursued just the opposite course. We have already seen how the royal domains were squandered. And instead of careful economy, we find lavish expenses in the king's household. In 1450 there was an outlay of £ 24 000 for household expenses,[2] more than

[1] Hence they are termed writs of green wax.

[2] Rot. Parl. V, 183.

twice as much as his grandfather used.[1] The ministers should have striven to keep a firm and heavy hand on the king's executive functions, on the organs of justice, if it were only on account of the revenues they yielded. Instead of this, they suffered matters to take their course, or even took sides with one or the other of the contending parties. Sheriffs were not prevented from oppressing. The courts of justice were allowed to exercise the greatest partialities, if the interest of the court party were furthered thereby.[2]

In regard to the peers of the realm, the policy had been to exclude from the royal council all who did not agree to he measures of the duke of Suffolk. They filled the ministry with men who had neither ability, experience nor great influence.[3] York had been purposely excluded by his commission in Ireland, the dukes of Exeter, Buckingham and Norfolk had not been asked. Over all these exclusions the commons of Kent express great indignation.[4] Such a course was certainly calculated to estrange the aristocracy. It was in direct opposition to the spirit of the English constitution.

The course pursued with the commons was still more hostile. The king was urged to bestow his property on these favourites and to compell the commons to supply the deficiency. "They sey that the kyng shuld lyve upon his commons, and that ther bodyes and goods ben the kynges."[5] According to

---

1 Henry IV's household expenses amounted to £ 10 000. Stubbs, Const. Hist. II, 552.

2 Gascoigne describes as one of the principal couses of the rebellion, 'quia justicia defecit in dominis et in judicibus,' p. 43.

3 Gascoigne (Turner Middle Ages III, 185) calls them boys, Cade's proclamation characterizes them as 'nowght browght up certeyn persones'.

4 2nd request.

5 Compare 2d complaint, Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 95. Fortescue in his Governance of England found it necessary do devote a chapter to the refutation of the argument which was urged, that it would be well for the king, if his commons were poor like those of France (pp. 137-40).

the captain of Kent the king's advisers continually sought to estrange him from the commons, and in view of the fact, that the government had been carried on in direct opposition to the will of the nation, this statement seems by no means improbable. "They sey that the commons of Inglond wolde fyrst dystroy the kynges fryndes and aftarwarde hym selff, and then brynge the duke ot Yorke to be kyng. So by ther fals menys and lyes they make hym to hate and to distroy his frendys and cherysythe his fals traytors."[1] Indeed, the counsellors are even accused of having filled mild king Henry's head with absolutistic notions. "They sey that owre soveryn lorde is above his lawys to his pleysewr, and that he may make it and breke it as hym lyst."[2]

Another grave charge made against the councillors is their corruptibility. "The fals traytours wyll sofre no man to come to the kynges presens for no cawse without bribes."[3] The statements of Gascoigne confirm these assertions.[4] Moreover it is impossible to suppose that the ministers took no part in the oppressions of their subordinates, which they made so little effort to restrain.

The external policy of the ministers, Suffolk's plan of making peace with France at all hazards, raised universal indignation. By his advice Maine and Anjou had been relinquished, and Normandy intrusted to the inexperienced duke of Somerset who lost it. The loss of France is repeatedly mentioned in Cade's documents.[5] Stern justice is demanded on

---

[1] Cade's procl., par. 3.

[2] Ib. par. 2. We find a curious parallel in the articles of the commons under Robin of Redesdale, where Edward IV's advisers are accused of the same offense (Warkworth's Chron. 45-51).

[3] Procl., par. 6. Compare the 19th par. (p. 98) and the 3rd complaint.

[4] Hujus mali radix est cupiditas astantium superioribus in officiis et in regnis. Pauli V, 313, n. 1.

[5] Complaint 7. 4th request.

the traitors, who delivered it to the enemy.[1] The political ballads and the popular literature of the times are full of allusions to it. Why did England hold aloft it's king's flimsy pretensions to the French crown with such pertinacity? Was this a simple case of wounded national pride? I think that the bitterness was mainly due to the ruin of maritime trade caused by the ill success of the French wars. England had lost control of the channel. Some years before 1450 a valuable political pamphlet was written on this very subject by a man well informed in England's commercial and political relations. The 'Libell of Englishe Policye' is an exhortation to 'alle England to keep the see environn, and namely the narowe see'.[2] She would then have control of all the traffic that passed through the straits of Dover, the trade of Italy, Spain, Portugal and France with Flanders, the staple of nations, Holland and the north. Thus she could enforce respect and protection for her own commerce. But in 1450 French corsairs scoured the sea. In the previous year they had even landed in Sussex, burning and plundering as they went.[3] The Bretons were distinguished in this line.[4]

Especially did England's principal industry in the middle ages, the wool traffic, suffer. The changed relations with France brought about hostilities with Burgundy. In 1449 the duke of that country had forbidden the import of English cloths into Flanders, Holland and Zealand, their principal market places. This was a staggering blow to the whole nation. For the raising of wool was one of the chief pursuits of the rural population. A large part of the inhabitants

---

1 4th request.

2 Wilhelm Herzberg, The Libell of Englishe Policye, Leipzig 1878, p. 25.

3 Sussex Arch. Col. XVIII, 18.

4 Libell of Eng. Pol. 30-1.

of the towns was engaged in buying, selling and making the wool into cloths. A petition of the commons in 1450[1] bitterly complains of the unemployed weavers, fullers, dyers, and of the women, who combed, carded and span the cloth, and of the buyers and sellers thereof. All these had become 'ydell pepull, which provoketh hem to synne and myschevous lyving.' Especially in Kent, where the chief part of the wool was made into cloth, was the decline of the trade most keenly felt. Cheyny, the leader of the riot at Canterbury, was a fuller.

Moreover, it is not to be forgotten that by far the greater part of the customs[2] of England came from the subsidies on wool. The decline of the wool traffic meant a large diminution of the royal revenues, which had to be supplied by more direct means of taxation.

It is also to be noted that several important articles of national consumption were imported from the English provinces in France. Salt was obtained from Guienne, and the loss of that province would have more than doubled it's price, for the French king had a monopoly of the salt in his dominions. This article was most important in the household economy of the middle ages. The ordinary Englishman lived on salted meats from May till November.[3] Nearly all the wine consumed was brought from France. The loss of that country brought it's consumption beyond the means of the middle classes.

One of the principal reasons why the rising of 1450 took such a violent form in Kent and Sussex, is because these counties were much further advanced in industry and

---

[1] Rot. Parl. V, 201.

[2] Prof. Stubbs has estimated them at £ 10000 a year. Const. Hist. II, 581.

[3] Rogers' Gascoigne cxxix.

in trade than the remaining parts of the island. Especially were the maritime districts involved in the insurrection. The Cinque Ports had been discontented in Cheyny's time.[1]

Whether the ministry were really to blame for the loss of France, is quite another question. In the long run it would have been as impossible for England to hold a country so much more extensive, as it was for her to hold the United States, when the Americans did not want to be held. As for the ministers having betrayed the king's interests there, I do not think this accusation at all probable. For whatever may have been their faults, these men seem to me to have been loyal to their king. Indeed, they appear to have been more like advocates of the absolutism practised by Henry VII than conspirators against the royal power. Under their rule there was doubtlessly much mismanagement and an enormous amount of misrule in England, but the charge of deliberate treason has never been proved against them.

The extortions of the subordinate officers of the king inflamed the people almost as much as the bad management of the council.[2] Among these the sheriffs seem to have born away the palm for exactions and misdeeds in general. Along with the undersheriffs they were able to baffle law after law against their misgovernment and extortions.[3] We have already seen how they oppressed the Kentish population with hunting taxes, 'enquestes' and green wax amercements. It is characteristic of the conduct of the sheriffs of Kent, that the insurgents demand the punishment not only of Crowmer,

---

1 Privy Council VI, 107.

2 Mr. Gairdner even goes so far as to term this the principal cause of the rebellion. Fortn. Rev. VIII, 445.

3 The numerous petitions of parliament against them are enumerated by Mr. Plummer in the introduction to Fortescue's Governance, p. 28, n. 6.

their sheriff at that time, but also of his predecessors Sleg, Isle and Robert Est. The chief source of the evil seems to have been that sheriffs, undersheriffs and bailiffs let their offices. The renters were compelled to use extortions in order to make the investment pay. In like manner the office of the king's tax-collector was sold to the highest bidder by the members of parliament, and with like result.

Another kind of oppression was practised by the king's favourites less in rank.[2] It consisted in getting the king to grant them the goods of persons impeached of treason before they had been condemned by law, and then to use all kinds of means to get them condemned. The people so impeached could not be committed to law, because their goods were in possession of the favourites, but languished in prison.[3] At the time when Cade's rebellion broke out, we find these same men striving to get the goods of some Kentish gentlemen thus impeached.[4] The commons of Kent also complain, that small freeholders were deprived of their land by false claims of enfeoffement to these and other favourites.[5] Owing to the lamentable state of the courts they could not even dare maintain their right.

Against this extortion and misrule there was very little protection to be found in the courts of law. "The law servyth of nowght ellys in thes days, but for to do wrong, for nothing is sped almost but fals maters by coulour of the law for mede; drede and favor", complains the proclamation. The best pict-

---

[1] 5th request.

[2] They are called the 'king's meniall servants of householde and other persons' in the complaint, whereas in the proclamation they are referred to as a part of the advisers of the king.

[3] 5th complaint.

[4] Procl. p. 96.

[5] 6th complaint.

ure of the utter lawlessness of the times is afforded by the Paston Correspondence.

Even the three chief judges were not above suspicion. The Kentishmen declare themselves willing to accept any judges for a commission, to try their wrongs, except the 'iij chefe juges, the which ben fals to beleve'.[1] Their suspicions certainly seem to have been justified in the case of John Prisot, chief justice of the commons pleas.[2]

The court of the king's bench, of which Fortescue was chief justice, seems to have exercised some sort of oppressions on the shire of Kent, without the consent of the king and his council.[3] We find complaints against the ministers of the court of Dover, who vexed and arrested people throughout all Kent, paying no attention to the fact, whether they were within the jurisdiction of Dover castle or not. They are accused of having passed their rights by subtle and untrue means and by actions falsely feigned, and are charged with great bribery.[4] There is also a demand in favour of the collectors of the '15. pennie' in Kent,[5] who were compelled to pay large sums of money into the treasury to sue out a writ called 'quorum nomina', proving the exemption of the barons of the Cinque Ports from this tax. The commons demand that the barons sue out this writ at their own cost. Lastly, we find the request, that Kent be divided into two districts for the

---

1 Three 15 Cent Chrs. 98.

2 Paston Letters I, 212.

3 5th request. I was unable to ascertain the nature of these exactions.

4 12th complaint.

5 I presume that Stowe here refers to the collector of the fifteenths granted in parliament. The expression 'the 10th penny' is still used on the continent to signify a tax. I could find no other tax with this name. Dodwell's History of Taxes and Taxations in England (1889) certainly gives none.

sessions of the peace,[1] which every one was bound to attend, or else be fined. There was only one place of sessions in the county. The long rectangular shape of Kent often compelled its inhabitants to make a journey of five days in order to take part.

Cade's documents mention several other causes of the rising. They complain that Kent had no free elections for parliament, but that letters were sent[2] to the rulers of the country, who compelled their tenants to elect other men than those of the common choice. But this evil was by no means peculiar to Kent. The party in power always did it's utmost to influence elections.[3]

The only demand of the insurgents, which we can call social,[4] is that the statute of labourers be repealed.[5] This law was a classical example of the way the landowning members of parliament treated the interests of the remaining population, when their own interests were at stake. It tried to make the peasant work for wages, on which he could not possibly subsist. Of course such an arbitrary and reactionary measure, in such contradiction to the condition of the labourer, could never be enforced. But notwithstanding popular opinion, parliament insisted on oppressive reenactments. Es-

---

1 15th complaint. These sessions were organized just after Tyler's rebellion, in order to quiet the numerous disturbances. Their object was to maintain the public peace of the counties.

2 13th complaint. Presumably by the court party. For although the Kentishmen were almost unanimously for York and reform, the previous members had been strictly Lancastrian. Crowmer, whom the insurgents beheaded, had been a member for Kent.

3 Five years later this evil was remedied in Kent. Comp. Plummer in Fortescue's Governunce of England, introd. 24, n. 1. For the custom of influencing elections see Stubbs II, 617-8; III, 256-8.

4 Of course several of the other causes mentioned were social too. The decline of the wool trade, for instance, was an economical factor.

5 5th request.

pecially in Kent, where the wages were higher than elsewhere,[1] and where the peasants rendered no customary services to their landlords,[2] such a measure must have been found galling.

From the nature of the causes mentioned above, it is clear that the rising of 1450 was mainly political.[3] Only one of the complaints of the Kentish rebels, the one concerning the statute of labourers, could be termed economical, not a single one is religious.[4]

We find not a single demand for new legislation.[5] Laws were plenteous enough; the trouble was that no one observed them.

> "Many lawys and lytylle ryght;
> Many acts of parlament
> And few kept wyth tru entent",

says a popular ballad of those days.[6] The crown, the executive power of England, was too weak to compel powerful subjects to observe them. All the evils described above were to a large extent due to this weakness. One faction of the nobles plundered the crown under the name of a ministry, another opposed it under pretense of reform. The whole strife was a simple contest for a great booty, and that booty was the king himself. The nobles waxed strong and mighty

---

1 J. E. Thorold Rogers, A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, Oxford 1866, I, 11.

2 Ib. 279.

3 Of course many social factors were at work. We shall afterwards see how this was the case in Salisbury. But it is characteristic for the movement, that the most violent outbreak occured in Kent, where the condition of the common people was the best in England.

4 As has been remarked by Mr. Green. Short History, p. 282.

5 The request that Kent be divided into two parts for the sessions of the peace, can hardly be thus termed, as an amendment of an already existing law is desired.

6 Wright, Polit. Poems, II, 252.

as the crown grew weaker. Every body, — lords, ministers and the king's officers grew rich from it's poverty.

> "So pore a kyng was never seene,
> Nor richere lordes alle bydenne,
> The communes may no more".

The commons in parliament had indeed done their best to save the crown, but their power was by this time exhausted. And in this light we may call the rising of 1450 a desperate, unconscious attempt of the people to save the sinking power of the crown.[2] Although they aided the party which was pulling it down, their real aim was a strong, just government. This alone could give them protection. They did not reflect that the strength of the nobles was the prime source of the crown's impotence. For the times needed a strong king, but a weak nobility. The house of York afterwards failed just as Lancaster had done, and it was only after the great feudal lords had exterminated themselves in the wars of the roses, that quieter times came.

---

1 Rot. Parl. V, 173. They declare that they can, may nor dare not grant the usual subsidies.

2 And yet Dr. Pauli maintains that Cade's rising threatened the crown with downfall and destruction (V, 312).

CHAPTER V.

ORIGIN OF THE KENTISH REVOLT. — BLACKHEATH AND SEVENOAKS. — THE RISING ELSEWHERE.

The first formidable outbreak in 1450 took place in the county ot Kent. Since Tylers's day the Kentishmen had been used to take the lead in such matters. Not because they were any worse off than other Englishmen; on the contrary, their condition was better. We have already noted that they rendered no customary service to their landlords; we have seen the high wages paid to the labourers, Kent's trade and it's manufactures. And just this advanced social state made it's inhabitants sturdy and independent, the first to be discontented, the most eager to avenge their wrongs.

Strange to say, we hear nothing of the origin of the insurrection. We are simply told that, in June, a great and well ordered host of rebellious Kentishmen appeared at Blackheath. Now the silence of the chroniclers may be partly due to the fact, that they were mainly Londoners. But matters must have taken a very silent course. A letter of May 27, written in London by Sir John Fastolf, knows nothing of disturbances, in which the author would certainly have been

very much interested.[1] We do not hear a word about any riots or disorder immediately preceding.

Continuous disturbances preceded the outbreak in 1381. Throughout all the country the lower classes were organized against their oppressors. The distemper of the people waxed hotter and hotter, till the misdeeds of the collectors of an unjust poll tax finally drove the people to arms, and a great disorganized mob of rebels surged irresistably on the capital. But in 1450 all went silently and orderly. The horde was more like a well regulated army, which for seven weeks kept up the same strict discipline in victory and retreat. Contemporaries do not fail to note the excellent order kept among them.[2] In many of the hundreds the rising assumed the character of a regular military levy of all the men capable of bearing arms, under their constables.[3] These constables must have acted under orders, as they were wont to do in times of war. Or could so many men have proceeded so quietly, independent of each other? Where the constables did not take part, some other leader appointed beforehand probably headed the men. And all must have advanced very quietly to an appointed place of meeting at an appointed time.

This rendezvous must have been some convenient spot in the interior of Kent.[4] They assembled during the Whitsuntide holidays, 24-30 May, perhaps on May 30.[5] At their head was a person called John Mortymer[6], a cousin to the duke

---

1 On news of the rebellion he fortified his house in Southwark against the rebels. Cade called him the greatest traitor in England or in France, and would not have been at all displeased at having his head. Past. Lett. I, 122-3.

2 Gregory 190, Lost Lond. Chr. (Caxton and Fabyan 642).

3 Archaeol. Cant. VII, 237.

4 When they appeared at Blackheath, they were already organized under a captain.

5 Appendix, p. 125.

6 This is the prevailing contemporary orthography.

of York,[1] who assumed the title of captain of Kent. It now becomes clear, in whose name the constables and other insurgents were summoned. Kent was devotedly Yorkist in sympathies, and the name Mortymer drew the people like a magnet. Moreover, in the proclamation for the captain's arrest it was found necessary to distinctly forbid all constables, on pain of death, to execute his orders. This shows that they had been accustomed to do so.

In view of the organized character of the movement, I think it very likely that the leader had been a part of the original plan. Nevertheless, several good contemporary authorities[2] say that the rebels chose themselves a captain. I hardly think that these Londoners refer to a formal election made in Kent. If one really did take place, it was probably a mere form, arranged by the captain and his fellow conspirators. But then the question arises, how did Mortymer get at the head of the other ringleaders? Was this a simple ruse of the Kentish gentry concerned in the rising, to avoid coming into prominence themselves?[3] In this case it would be difficult to explain the conduct of the squire Poynings, who was not at all ashamed to act as Cade's carver and swordbearer. It is indeed true that many persons of position had been engaged in stirring up the February revolts.[4] The gentlemen whose goods

---

1 Lost Lond. Chr. (Caxton, Fabyan 622). In this case he must have claimed descent from Edmund, the last earl of March, as Dr. Pauli observed. Gascoigne (p. 190) says that he was descended from Roger Mortymer, a bastard. I cannot conceive whom he meant.

2 Gregory 190, Lost Lond. Chr. (Fab. and Caxton), Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 66, Engl. Chr. 64; Grey Friars' Chr. 19 says that Cade made himself a captain.

3 Three 15th Cent. Chrs iv. "That there must have been a collusion on part of some of the Kentish gentry seems past a doubt. By setting up a pretender they avoided incurring the highest responsibility themselves".

4 The municipal authorities are charged not to obey the orders 'of any persone, of what degree, condition or astate that ever he be'. Privy Council VI, 91.

and lands the king's favourites were trying to have confiscated when the rebellion broke out, 'calling them rysers and traytors and the kynges enimys',[1] in all probability belonged to the same clique. But I do not think that the Kentish gentry had the control of matters. How could the squires and gentlemen have kept the reins in their hands without occupying any posts of importance in the host? We find none of them among Cade's petty captains or advisers.[2]

Nor it is reasonable to suppose that Mortymer was made captain by his fellow conspirators on account of his military ability, for no one had ever heard of him previously.[3] The most likely hypothesis is that the whole affair had been settled before hand, that the people were summoned in Mortymer's name, and that they came, the Yorkist gentry along with the rest.

The first thing done after the commons were assembled, was to organize the host. According to our lost London

---

[1] Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 96.

[2] With the exception of Poynings.

[3] Mr. Gairdner (Gregory xx) maintains that "the people in some part of Kent had found a leader for themselves; and he proved to be a man of such remarkable energy and tact that he soon got all the country gentlemen of Kent to go along with him'. But Gregory, who is here quoted, really says that he '*compellyd* alle the gentellys to a rysse whyte hem', not '*compassed*', as Mr. Gairdner cites, which proves just the reverse of what is maintened. It is further stated (Gregory xxi), 'when the time for joint action came his (Cade's) power and skill as a military leader was so manifest, that all readily submitted to him'. I am not of the opinion that Cade's military skill was so paramount'. The passage of Gregory on which this view is based, reads: "They kepte ordyr among them, for als goode was Jacke Robyn as John at the Noke; for alle were as hyghe as pygysfete unto the tyme that they shulde comyn and speke with suche statys and massyngers as were sent unto them. Thenne they put alle hyr pouer unto the man that namyd hym captayne of alle hyr oste". The statement that Cade only received full powers when negotiations had to be carried on with lords and messengers (presumbly from the king), is evidently wrong. Cade was undisputed captain when the commons appeared at Blackheath.

authority the captain did this himself;[1] at any rate, we are told nothing definite about the organization. The captain had the supreme command with absolute power over life and death, and from the time when they treated with the king, he also had the power of negotiating on their behalf. One of his most important advisers was Robert Poynings, esq., of Southwark, whose office was to carve the meat and bear the sword of the captain before him on public occasions,[2] from which it would seem that the latter put on a good deal of style. Poynings appears to have been a man of great influence with Cade. Payn relates how by his threats he compelled Cade, to refrain from his design of beheading that worthy yeoman.[3] In a roll of parliament he is described as having taken a great part in stirring up the revolt.[4]

There were also captains under Cade. One of these called Parys was executed by him,[5] another called Boucher was captured later on;[6] a third, Thomas Bigg, of Lambeth in Surrey, yeoman, was outlawed on account of this treason.[7] It is probable that some of the ringleaders afterwards executed belonged to that body. As persons of prominence among the rebels, perhaps as advisers of the captain, might be mentioned Nicolas Jakes and John Rammesay, a wine drawer, both of whom were executed after the rebellion.[8]

The number of the rebels must have been by no means

---

1 Caxton, ch. 26, Fabyan 622.

2 His title was carver and swordbearer of the captain of Kent.

3 Paston Letters I, 133.

4 Rot. Parl. V, 396, the which Robert caused and stirred up the grete parte of such as wer adherents and accompenyd to the said traytur the rise.

5 Fabyan 623.

6 Issue Rolls 471.

7 Rot. Parl. V, 396.

8 Privy Council VI, 106.

insignificant.[1] But the so-called Gregory exaggerates mightily when he estimates them at 46000. If we assume that one half of the able-bodied men (about $^1/_5$ of the population) appeared, which is certainly not too little, Gregory's estimate would give a population of 450000 for Kent in 1450. But it did not have much more than 308500 inhabitants at the beginning of our own century. I myself do not believe that the number assembled could have exceeded 10000.[2] Cade afterwards found it necessary to leave his fortified camp before the king's army, which did not exceed that number.

The first thing undertaken by the rebels thus organized was an advance on London. Accordingly on June 10 or 11[3] we find them reaching Blackheath, a large plain in the southeastern vicinity of the capital. There they constructed a regular military camp fortified with a ditch and rows of stakes. The place itself is well adapted for a camping ground. It is elevated above the adjoining country and therefore easy to defend.[4] The object of the Kentishmen in camping there was evidently to watch London, and to take advantage of any divertment made there in their favour. For they had friends in the common council of London, on whose assistance they counted. We still possess the passport given by their captain to Thomas Cooke, draper,[5] who probably carried on the negotiations between them and their friends. Although Cooke had as yet assumed no important position in city politics, he

---

[1] Lost Lond. Chr. (Fabyan 622, Caxton).

[2] The estimate given by Dr. Pauli and others, that the number was 20000, is evidently a misunderstanding of Worcester, who asserts that the king had 20000 soldiers.

[3] Appendix, p. 127.

[4] In 1381 the insurgents encamped there.

[5] Stowe's Annales 630.

was evidently regarded as a person of ability.[1] He certainly played a very important part in city politics in later times.[2]

Only one of these negotiations has been preserved us, a ruse of the captain of Kent to better his financial condition. With this end in view he sent a commandment to Cooke, instructing him to charge all Italians and other strangers in London to provide him with 12 harnesses, 24 brigandines, 12 battle axes, 12 glaves, 6 horses completely harnessed, and 1000 marks ready money; 'and if this our demand be not observed and done, we shall have the heads of as many as we can get of them.' It is to be supposed that the Italians complied with his request. For we afterwards hear of six horses possessed by the captain of Kent,[3] but not of his having hurt any stranger in London.[4] He might well have done this without in any wise incurring the displeasure of the Londoners. These munitions of war were, of course, intended for his army, and the 1000 marks, if he ever received them, were probably devoted to the same purpose. At any rate, nothing like this sum was afterwards found amongst his booty.

In order to justify the insurrection in the eyes of the population, the captain, while still in Kent, had issued the proclamation of 4 June, about which we have already spoken at length. It states that the king was surrounded by rascally, lowborn persons, who continually misinformed him; urged him to break his laws and estranged him from his commons, tell-

---

1 He was of the common house and therwith a man of great boldnesse in speche and well spoken, and syngulerly wytted and well reasoned. Fabyan 660.

2 Orrige, Illustrations of Cade's Rebellion, p. 11. Cooke became sheriff in 1453, alderman in 1456, mayor in 1462-3. In 1465 he was made knight of the bath by Edward IV, but was afterwards grievously wronged by that king and lord Rivers, his treasurer. At the time of Henry VI's restoration he was member of parliament.

3 Privy Council VI, 99.

4 Stowe 630.

ling him that they wished to put the duke of York on the throne. They urge him to live only on his commons and prevent him from resuming the property he has wasted on themselves. They suffer no one to come into his presence without bribes.

The good duke of Gloucester was impeached of treason on the testimony of one false traitor alone.[1] The traitor Suffolk was impeached by all the commons of England, 'the whiche nombre passyd a quest of xxiij M',[2] and yet was not suffered to die according to law. His cursed affinity even urged the king to fight a battle with his own people for his sake.

They get people condemned as traitors, because they covet their goods. Even now they are trying to get the possessions of Kentish gentlemen, whom they call "rysers and traytors and the kynges enimys. But they shall be fond the kynges trew legemen and best frendys with the helpe of Jesu, to whom we cry day and nyght with many M more, that God of his grace and rytwysness shall ... destroy the fals govournors ..., that hath browght us to nowght".

There is no law in the land, but every thing is sped for bribery and favour. The false council has lost all, the king's law, his merchandise, his rule over the sea, his French provinces; his common people are destroyed and he himself is so poor that he cannot even pay for his meat and drink.

We wish it to be known that we do not blame all the persons about the king, but such as shall in a fair trial be found guilty. Also, that we will neither rob, plunder nor steal, but this we do desire, that all these faults be amended. We exhort all the king's true liegemen to help us. But whosoever does not wish these evils to be amended, "he is falser than a

---

[1] Suffolk here is meant.

[2] A curious computation.

Jewe or Sarasyn, an we shall with as good wyll lyve and dye upon hym as apon a Jewe or a Sarasyn. For who is agenst us in this casse hym wyll we marke, for he is not the trew kyngys legeman".

His true commons desire that the king avoid the progeny[1] and affinity of the duke of Suffolk, who must be punished according to law, and that he recall the dukes of York, Exeter, Buckingham[2] and Norfolk. The murderers of Gloucester must be punished, and those who betrayed our father the cardinal[3] and the dukes of Warwick[4] and Exeter,[5] and who lost all our possessions in France. We desire that the extortions practiced on the common people should cease, the green wax, and the oppressions of the king's bench and of the purveyors. The statute of labourers must be repealed, and the great extortioners, Slegge, Crowmer, Isle and Robert Est be punished.

Let the king send a fair commission into Kent to investigate every man's governance and to try all traitors and bribers. The goods of the condemned must be kept for his own use, and not given away. For this commission we refuse no judges except the three highest, who are 'fals to beleve'.

The guilty will wry against this, but God will bring them down. They will go to the king and say that we will depose him, if they be taken from him. If we were disposed against our sovereign lord, which God forbid, what might then the traitors help him?

---

1 The progeny referred to is Suffolk's son, a young man at this time. Probably Alicia, Suffolk's wife, is also hinted at. She was a woman of influence at court. We find her afterwards accused in London and tried by her peers in the next parliament held. Worcester 475.

2 Humphrey Stafford, duke of Buckingham, had already been recalled. We shall find him negotiating with the rebels later on.

3 Cardinal Beaufort here is meant. The charge seems absurd.

4 The father of the kingmaker.

5 Father of Exeter mentioned above.

When the evils are thus remedied and bribery is forbidden on pain of death, he will reign like a true king "and have love of God and of his people, for he shall have so gret love of his people that he shall with God's help conqwere where he wyll. And as for us, we shall be all weye redy to defend owr countre from all nacions with our owne goods, and to go withe our sovereyne lorde wher he wyll commaunde us, as his trew legemen".

"God be our guide
And then we shall speed
Whoever says nay."[1]

It is very probable that Cade had this document multiplied for distribution among such persons of note as wished for information on the rebellion.[2] It was in quest of something of this kind that Fastolf sent his servant Payn, during the captain's first stay at Blackheath.[3] The latter claims that Cade seized him as a spy and was about to have him beheaded. But Poynings and some of his friends came and by dint of threats prevailed upon the captain to leave off from his purpose. Payn asserts that he was only able to save his own life by swearing to dissuade his master from his design of reisting the rebels,[4] and by joining them himself. But we have already seen what just reasons we have for doubting Payn's

---

1 The version given by Sharon Turner ends with these lines. Middle Ages III, 279.

2 Two copies exist at the present day, as we have already seen.

3 Not during the second stay, as the editor believes. After the second encampment the rebels entered London and then returned home. But Payn relates how he was dragged about through Kent and Sussex. Moreover, as a member of the privy council, Fastolf would have known all about the demands of the rebels before July 1, when Cade returned to Blackheath. There would have been no object in his sending for them.

4 He had fortified his house in Southwark for that purpose. Paston Letters I, 133.

veracity. We know that he was probably as much a rebel as most of the others assembled at Blackheath.

During the month of May the king was holding parliament at Leicester. Is was the same parliament with which he had so much trouble at Westminster. He had tried in vain to get a grant of supplies there, and had adjourned it to Leicester on 30 March.[1] There it could be more easily manipulated. The political atmosphere was not so hostile as in London. On 29 April it assembled.[1]

Troublesome times were anticipated. Many of the great lords came escorted by unusually strong retinues. On 4 May the earl of Devonshire, a staunch Yorkist, arrived with an escort of 300 men; on the day following Warwick, the kingmaker, arrived with more than 400 attendants.[2]

The first thing the commons did after they were assembled, was to pass an act of resumption.[3] The king indeed agreed to the act, but added so many provisions as to thwart it's purpose. From the account of Gascoigne[4] it seems that a quarrel arose, probably on this very account. But his statement that the commons granted no supplies in consequence, is erroneous. They granted an income tax and this was all they dared give.[5]

The ministers named by the king during this session were not calculated to win the favour of the commons. According to a letter of May 13,[6] the new ministers were all

---

1 Rot, Parl. V, 172.

2 Past. Letters I, 127.

3 A letter from Leicester, written May 6, states that the king had 'sumwhat graanted to have the resumpsion agayne in summe, but nat in alle'. This evidently refers to the act of resumption in the Parl. Rolls V, 183-199, to which a great number of provisions are added.

4 Sharon Turner, Middle Ages III, 185.

5 Rot. Parl. V, 172-4. 'We canne, may ne darr not' etc., ib. 173.

6 Past Letters I, 128.

adherents of Suffolk, but from the state papers it is certain that not all the men named in the letter were appointed. On 25 May the earl of Northumberland, and not lord Rivers was made constable of England.[1] Lord Beauchamp was made chamberlain, not viscount Beaumont.[2] The treasury remained in the hands of lord Say, the most hated of all the surviving ministers. None of these men belonged to the popular party.

There was material enough for stormy sessions. The wants of the government were enormous, but the poverty and grievances of the commons were equally great. It may be true, as Gascoigne maintains, that the king's advisers intended to keep the commons together till their expenses forced them to grant the desired subsidies.

At any rate, the news of the Kentish insurrection compelled the king to adjourn the parliament. He assembled an army to resist the rebels without much trouble. The lords with their retinues were already there. It only remained for him to place himself at their head. From the description of an eye- witness[3] it is evident that such was the composition of the main part of the army. The chronicle edited by Mr. Giles distinctly speaks of it as the king 'cum suis principibus et dominis parliamenti'.[4]

By 7 June a powerful army was assembled.[5] On or soon after that date it set out for London, almost 100 miles away, where it arrived on 13 June. The rebels still lay at Blackheath[6]

---

[1] Rymer V, II, 25.

[2] Past. Letters I, li, n. 2.

[3] Gregory 191. The passage is quoted below, p. 79.

[4] P. 39. The Cotton MS., Caxton, Fabyan, Three 15th Cent. Chrs. and Davies' Engl. Chr. continually refer to the soldiers as the 'lords men'.

[5] Appendix, p. 128, n. 2.

[6] Chr. ed. Giles 39, ibidem super Blackhethe recedentem praefatum Johannem cum suo exercitu invenit. This is certainly a mistake. All authorities maintain that they lay there till June 17.

and the king's advisers wished to attack them immediately. But many of the lords thought differently. A camp was made at Clerkinwalls near St. John's abbey, and meetings of the council were held, which probably occupied 14 June. It was decided to treat with the rebels, and several spiritual and temporal lords were sent to confer with them.[1] These negotiations lasted two days, June 15 and 16. On 16 or 17 June[2] the ambassadors brought back the demands of the rebels in the shape of the two bills already described: the complaint of the commons of Kent and causes of the assemby on the Blackheath, and the requests of the captain of the great assembly in Kent.[3] The former protests that it was openly rumored that the king meant to revenge Suffolk's death on the innocent county. It complains about the alienation of the royal possessions, the exclusion of the lords of royal blood and the corruptibility of the king's advisers. It notes the abuses of purveyance and the infamous way in which the poor were robbed of their lands. It is rumoured that even the king has been deprived of his domains in France. This must be investigated and the guilty punished. We already know the complaints against the sheriffs, the barons of the Cinque Ports and the ministers of the court of Dover. We have seen how the elections in Kent were perverted by the

---

1 The king had perhaps treated with Cade before. In Issue Rolls of the Exchequer we find John Solers, esq., promised a reward of £ 10 for having been sent to Cade on business concerning the king (p. 470). He would hardly have received so much for a simple ride from London to Blackheath. Nor could he in this case have sustained £ 1 damages on his goods. It is more likely that he was sent from Leicester. But it is also possible that he was despatched to Blackheath at the time of Cade's second stay there. Returning he must then have sought his lord at Kenilworth.

2 Appendix, p. 127.

3 The verbal answers given by the chroniclers are written from hearsay of what the documents contained.

great lords, how the tax collector was appointed, how the county suffered under the sessions of the peace.

The first request demands the resumption of all the alienated royal possessions. The remaining requests correspond with a part of the proclamation. In the same words they demand the punishment of Suffolk's adherents and the recall of York and his friends. Here too, the former are accused of Gloucester's murder and of having betrayed France. The last demand is that the extortions practiced on the common people should cease.

The sessions of the council in which Cade's answers were submitted occurred on the next day, June 17. They must have been unusally full. The reform party was probably represented by almost as many lay lords as were in the parliament.[1] These men must have advocated that Cade's request be accepted. The punishment of their enemies, their own recall to the royal council, — what more could they themselves have demanded? Warwick, who had attended the Leicester parliament with an unusually large retinue, was there. Could he have condemned a bill, which distinctly demanded his own recall? And the only price to be paid for all these advantages, was to remedy a few local Kentish grievances, which every right-thinking man ought to have wished removed.

Nevertheless, the court party still prevailed. The articles of the rebels were summarily rejected and it was decided to fight. The king in person assigned the following day for the attack.[2] Before the camp of the rebels it was proclaimed

---

[1] Gregory, p. 191, says that the greater part of the temporal lords of England were with the king. Worcester speaks of his having assembled 'multos dominos'. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. assert, that 'the kynge with *all* his lordys made hem redy' to withstand Cade.

[2] Worcester 470.

that all should quit the field.[1] This all occurred on 17 June. On the following night the rebels deserted their camp at Blackheath and fell back into the weald of Kent Early the next morning the king's army started out in pursuit. As they passed through London, it is probable that the chronicler known as Gregory saw them. He gives us a vivid description of the host. The king road in front armed at all pieces.[2] Then came 'the moste partye of temporalle lordys of this londe of Engelond in there a beste araye'. Their retinues were with them to the number of 10 000 persons,[3] 'redy as they alle shulde have gon to bataylle into any londe of Crystyndome'. Before 9 o' clock they had reached Blackheath.[4] But there a halt was made and a council called.[5] It was decided to send only a part of the army in pursuit of the rebels. The remainder was to stay at Blackheath.

Accordingly, the division sent against the rebels marched into the weald of Kent. Sir Humphrey Stafford and his cousin, William Stafford, esq., were at it's head.[6] They probably owed their appointment to their relationship with Humprey Stafford, duke of Buckingham. This nobleman

---

1 Gregory 190-1. 'Uppon whyche answere that *the kyng*, thedyr sent by hys lordys, dyd make a crye in the kyngys name of Engelonde that alle . . . shulde a-voyde the fylde'. This is a copyist's mistake or one due to the omission of some words. It would be contrary to usage for a king to make his own proclamations.

2 His suit of amour was provided him by the knight Lancaster, who had just before distinguished himself by gallant rides from Leicester to London and elsewhere. Issue Rolls 475.

3 This estimate is more probable than the more exaggerated statements of other writers. The Eng. Chr. gives 15 000, Worcester, 20 000.

4 Worcester 470.

5 Caxton, ch. 26, by aduys of his counseyll. Vit. 106 b, Fabyan 623.

6 Vit. 106 b says that a second squire was associated with them.

was then very powerful in the councils of the king, and is not at all unlikely that their troops were largely composed of his and his friends' retainers.[1]

They marched very rapidly. On the same 18th June they came up with the enemy at Sevenoaks,[2] a town about 18 miles south of Blackheath. The captain of Kent kindly warned them to desist. A council of war was held by the leaders, but they resolved to carry out their instructions,[3] and these were to attack the foe.[4] Nothwithstanding the fact that it was late in the afternoon, the battle began. The king's forces were utterly defeated. Both their leaders were among the slain. They were beaten with great loss.[5]

Upon the news of this calamity, the remaining forces of the king were ordered to march against the rebels, but they refused to go.[6] Mutiny broke out. The soldiers began to clamour for the very things the Kentishmen themselves desired. They demanded justice on the traitors about the king, and many lords joined in their demand. Even members of the

---

1 Pauli V, 309 calls his army 'ein kleiner Haufe Edelleute'!

2 The Chr. ed. Giles lets the battle take place at Bromley, a town between Blackheath and London.

3 Fabyan 622.

4 Caxton, ch. 26, to fight with the capytayne and to take hym and brynge hym and his accessories to the kyng. The Eng. Chr. thinks that this army was only a small body of men, sent out to espy where the rebels were. But we have just seen that they had instructions to attack Cade.

5 So all authorities maintain except Worcester, who says that only 23 were slain.

6 Chr. ed Giles 40, *'post quorum interitum* qui fuerunt ex parte regis super Blackhethe, renuerunt contra praefatos prosequi. The Eng. Chr. says that the king 'wolde have sent certayn lordis with a power for to have distressid the Kentishmenne, but thair men . . . wolde not fighte . . .' It dates the episode wrong, according to it's wont. The author lets it occur before the battle of Sevenoaks Caxton says that both took place at the same time. But the testimony of the Chr. ed Giles and of Fabyan are conclusive, 'whan worde came of the ouerthrowe of the Staffordes'.

king's household joined in the clamour.[1] The army threatened to desert to the captain.[2]

The king had to yield every point. Say, the treasurer, was seized in his presence[3] and thrown into the tower of London. William Crowmer, sheriff of Kent, was led off to Fleet prison.[4] The soldiers clamored for judgement on the bishop of Salisbury, the abbot of Gloucester,[5] baron Dudley, Thomas Danyell, John Norice, John Terhaue and many others. But none of them were to be found. They had taken warning and disappeared before hand.[6]

It must have been a mournful night for the king, the night of June 18, which he passed at Greenwich.[7] The lords resided with him,[8] but all control over the army was lost. It probably lingered at Blackheath for a while, and then returned in great tumult to London. There the soldiers plundered the houses of two of the king's unpopular advisers, Dudley and Starlaue. They seem to have remained in the city till Henry left for Kenilworth castle, when they accompanied him as far as Berkhamstead.[9]

Every thing had to be abandoned. The council recognized the impossibility of holding London against the rebels and

---

1 Caxton, ch. 26.

2 Dr. Pauli here relates: "Eine Menge Stimmen wurden laut, welche behaupteten, die Forderungen der Gemeinen seien keineswegs so unbegründet, es wäre Wahnsinn, wenn desshalb Landsleute gegen Landsleute das Schwert zögen". In vain did I search through the authorities for these voices. They too had heard nothing of them, loud though they were.

3 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 67.

4 Not to the tower, as Worcester states.

5 Mr. Cooper states that he was an advocate of the rebellion. Arch. Cant. VII, 243. So also Furley, Weald of Kent II, I, 401.

6 Fabyan 623.

7 Gregory 191. It had so been decided by the council: Fabyan 623.

8 Chr. ed. Giles 40, domini qui cum ipso erant apud Greneviche.

9 Nicolas' Lond. Chr. 136.

prepared to depart. But they first provided for the defense of the tower. On 13 June £ 100 were appropriated for that purpose.[1] It is possible that the artillery, which Thomas Vaghan, master of the ordinance, brought into the field on June 20, was also devoted to these ends.[2] On 1 July measures were taken to assemble troops in Chester and Lancaster. Two knights, Thomas Stanley and Thomas Haryngton, were appointed to raise the military levy there and to hold it in readiness for action.[3]

The municipal authorities of London did their utmost to retain the king in their midst. The mayor and the aldermen came to him and begged him to stay. They promised to die with him, if it should be necessary, and even offered to pay his household expenses for half a year.[4] But their sovereign did not feel himself safe among them. He had heard that the captain of Kent was advancing with renewed strength, now that the royal army had retired. According to a contemporary, the king's whole stay in London only lasted two or three days.[4] He could not have arrived there before 27 June. During this time he was probably occupied with the army at Blackheath and Greenwich. On the 28th we find him at Westminster, signing a treaty with the grand-master of Prussia in person.[5] About the end of the month[6] he departed for the castle of Kenilworth. Enemies were approaching London from all sides. The rebels were undisputed masters of the situation.

---

[1] Privy Council VI, 95.

[2] Ib. 94. Dr. Pauli informs us that the garrison consisted of 1000 men (V, 309), but I was unable to find the source of his information.

[3] Privy Council VI, 95.

[4] Three 15th Cent. Chr's. 67.

[5] Rymer V, II, 26.

[6] Worcester 470, circa finem dicti mensis Junii.

The records of most of the outbreaks outside of Kent and Sussex have been lost. Had only more of the local records been preserved! The rising of 1450 would not present the picture of a local Kentish outbreak, but of a great upheaval of the nation. For revolts occurred all over the country.[1] Almost the whole south was in arms. In the county of Southampton outbreaks occurred at Portsmouth and Winchester.[2] In Dorset and Wiltshire the insurrection took a particularly violent form, at first against the bishop of Salisbury. On 28 June the commons of Wiltshire plundered his chariot, which was laden with a great treasure. It was even rumoured that the sum taken amounted to 10000 marks.[3] On the day following the bishop himself was executed by the infuriated populace at Edington. It was the feast of St. Peter and Paul,[4] and he was just reading high mass there. The people tore him away from the altar, dragged him to a high hill, a mile out of town,[5] and put him to death just as he was, in all his episcopal splendor. They stripped his robes from his body and rent them into thousand pieces, which were borne away as trophies.[6] All his property was seized by the people dwelling on his do-

---

1 Hujus infelicitatis tempore fuerat ista insurrectio dispersa per plures artes totius Angliae, quia errantes erant omnes plebei contra suos dominos et superiores, non metientes eos spoliare. Chr. ed Giles 41.

2 Privy Council VI, 107-8.

3 Engl. Chr. 64.

4 Ib. 64, Gascoigne 189. Worcester (471) gives 30 June, but this is one of the very few instances in which his chronology seems to be at fault. The two former give a holiday (St. Peter and Paul), which is much easier to remember than the day of a month. Moreover, the account of the Eng. Chr. in this case is otherwise very exact, whereas Worcester only mentions the fact of the bishop's having been killed. Gregory, who is very unreliable for events outside of London, dates the event June 14.

5 Gregory 194.

6 Engl. Chr. 64.

mains, — cattle, waggons, clothes, books, — even the lead on the roofs of the houses was melted down and divided in some places. The movement was especially violent in Sherbourne in Dorset. All the men, women and children of the neighbourhood between 12 and 60 years of age were assembled. The plundered goods were equally divided among them, every one receiving six pence. All swore to be true and to hold together. They thus thwarted the vengeance of the king, who would have had to punish the whole shire. But as their sovereign had very much livelyhood there, he wisely preferred to forgive them and granted all a general pardon.[1]

Here for the first time in 1450 we meet marked social elements. William Ascough, bishop of Salisbury, was indeed one of the hated advisers of the king and a man of great influence at court. He was accused of treason along with the rest of the court party. But this was not the only grudge his flock had against him. Not only did it execute the culprit, but the possessions of the sea of Salisbury were plundered. Had the people struck at the false adviser or the bad bishop alone, the property of the sea would have been left for a better successor. Some social causes were at work. His feudal rights over them must have been oppressive, or perhaps he misused these rights. A contemporary describes him as a 'wonder cowetous' man.[2] We cannot fail o note the difference between the insurrection in Dorset and

---

1 Gregory 194.

2 He evidently had money. A short time before he lent the king 1000 marks on some jewels. Rymer V, II, 21. Strange to say he was regarded by some as a martyr after his death The Chr. ed. Giles tells how the legs of the man, who first stabbed him, were consumed by an unquenchable fire. The poor wretch is said to have acknowledged the justice of his punishment, 'quia percussit sanctum Dei famulum'. P. 42.

Wiltshire and the purely political movement in Kent and Sussex. The contrast with the quiet form it took in Norfolk is very marked.

The population of Wiltshire must have been inflamed to an extraordinary extent. It appears to have remained in revolt throughout July. As late as August 19 it was rumoured that 9 or 10000 men were in open revolt there.[1] Lord Moleyns had a hard time quieting them. It would be interesting to know whether he used force or persuasion to quiet the Wiltshiremen. Perhaps the former. For although Moleyns himself had possessions in Wiltshire, he belonged to the court party, whereas the noblemen who favoured the rebels, belonged to the Yorkists.[2]

We hear of no outbreaks in the Keltic southwest or in any of the shires bordering on Wales. The most westerly town in which we hear of trouble, was Gloucester.[3] But in the east the movement was more violent. The commons of Essex arose, like those of Kent, and marched on London. They were probably in communication with their southern neighbours.[4] A mutual advance had been agreed upon and they arrived at Mile End, a northeastern suburb of London, on July 2, the same day that the Kentishmen reached Southwark, on the southern side.[5] Like the latter, they too, were organized under a captain.[6] They were not as numerous as

---

1 Paston Letters I, 140.

2 The passage in question throws no light on the subject. 'Lord M. hadde sore be laboured in his cuntre to peas and stille the people there, to restreynge them from rysyng'.

3 Privy Council VI, 108. It received one of Cade's quarters.

4 Vit. 107a says distinctly that they came, 'to accompanye the said capitayne' of Kent.

5 The Lost Lond. Chr. evidently stated this, but assumes that Cade reached Southwark on July 1, which is a mistake. Vitt. 107a, Fabyan 623.

6 Grey Friars' Chr. 19.

the rebels of the southeast, and contented themselves with playing a subordinate part. Their captain let Cade manage the affairs of London. Perhaps he so readily submitted because he really took his colleague for a Mortymer. In Essex, as in the other parts of the country, the higher classes were involved in the revolt. Katherine de la Poole, abbess of Barking, received a pardon on this account.[1]

In Norfolk matters took a quieter course. The Paston Letters tell us of no popular outbreak at all. But in August a general meeting of the gentry had been arranged, to deliberate on the public grievances. The duke of Norfolk,[2] the most powerful nobleman of the shire, attended. The earl of Oxford wished to attend, but was prevented by a summons from the king. However he was agreed to the proceedings and promised to do his best to get the council to accept the articles they should draw up. John Paston, Sir Miles Stapleton[3] and Thomas Brewes were among the ringleaders.[4] About August 21 the assembly met at Framingham.

The chief source of complaint in Norfolk seems to have been the lawlessness and extortions of Sir Thomas Tuddenham, it's own sheriff,[5] and of a lawyer called John Heydon, who had been sheriff and recorder of Norwich. These men had quarrels with the city of Norwich and the town of Swaffham, the common lands of which they had greatly damaged.[6]

---

[1] Sussex Arch. Col. XVIII, 18, n. 4. Was she related to William de la Poole, duke of Suffolk? This would indeed be strange.

[2] A great friend and adherent of the duke of York.

[3] Afterwards in parliament as a Yorkist. Paston Letters I, 161, n. 1.

[4] From the letters written by Oxford to them and the duke, all our knowledge of the incident is gleaned. These letters are dated Aug. 21. Paston-Letters I, 140-3.

[5] Also steward of a part of Lancaster (Paston Letters I, 129. We afterwards find him acting in that capacity. Ib. 167). He was a favourite at court.

[6] Ib. 168. We hear of the great loss and damage, done to the comyn of Swaffham '*benyming (?)* 600 acres lond of her comyn'.

They were in strife with Sir John Fastolf, John Paston and many others, and seem to have been cordially hated by the people at large.[1] The representations of the assembly at Framingham seem indeed to have induced the council to send a judicial commission into Norfolk.

But however quietly matters may have taken their course in the shire itself, there were disturbances enough at Norwich, the capital. The council found it necessary to honor the city with rebels' quarters on repeated occasions.[2] The disposition of it's inhabitants evidently required quieting.

Norwich and Coventry were the most northerly towns in which disturbances seem to have occurred. We hear of no trouble north of the 53rd parallel. Now the people there were by no means without grievances. They suffered as much as the other commons. Especially were they troubled by an evil called distresses, which was very prevalent throughout all the north.[3] Under pretence of debts the lords drove away their cattle. But the people of the north were more under the sway of the great barons, who ruled there. They were not as quick to rebel as their brethren in South and Middle England. It is worthy of note that these northen parts, where we find no rebellion, afterwards supported the house of Lancaster. Where the rebellion raged, we afterwards find the most Yorkists.

---

1 Paston says that they were so universally hated that the people would rise in revolt, if they were not punished. Ib. 145.

2 Privy Council VI, 107-8.

3 Rot. Parl. V, 137, 139, 200.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REBELS IN LONDON. — END OF CADE'S REBELLION.

The next thing the authorities tell us about the Kentish rebels, is that they returned to their old camp at Blackheath on 1 July.[1] We hear nothing of what they did between 18 June and that time, but it is certain that they was busy recruiting in Kent and Sussex, for Cade certainly marched through parts of the latter. The large number of pardoned Sussex rebels on the patent roll would render such a supposition probable, even though the chronicles know nothing about it.[2] But we have indubitable documentary proof on

---

[1] We here meet with a strange statement of Gregory's. 'The same captayne come agayne, as the Kenttyschemen sayde, but hyt was a nothyr that namyd hymselfe the captayne. And he come to the Blacke Hethe' (p. 191.) Mr. Gairdner has accepted this statement He thinks that the first captain must have fallen at Sevenoaks. He remarks that the first captain kept excellent order among the rebels. 'Cade certainly did not do so after he entered London' (Stephens' Dict. VIII), 172). But I consider it an error to regard Cade's plunderings as a mark of loose discipline. As far as we know, nobody plundered contrary to his command. As Mr. Gairdner has himself remarked, there is a total abstinence of corroborative testimony to this assertion (Gregory xxi). Every chronicle, every state paper knows only of one captain. The assertion is simply one of the many rumours which the author jotted down.

[2] Hall (p. 220) indeed states that many idle and vagabond persons from Sussex and Surrey joined Cade after the battle of Sevenoaks.

the subject. After the battle of Sevenoaks Andrew Hooles, keeper of the privy seal, was sent to interview Cade, 'whom er he couth find he sought as well in Sussex as in Kent.'[1] Payn in his well known letter complains: "iiij times before that tyme I was caryed abought thorought Kent and Sussex."[2]

I think it likely that Cade took up head-quarters in some convenient place in Sussex, from which he summoned the military levies under the name of Mortymer. For the rising here seems to have been more of a regular military levy than in Kent itself. Although the insurgents were drawn mainly from the eastern and middle parts, we find the constables of 22 of the 70 hundreds arrayed under Cade's banner. I do not think it necessary to assume that the rebels visited the towns which show the largest number of insurgents on the patent roll. They must then have touched Brightling, Dallington, Battle, Haylesham, Seaford, Lewes, and from there have gone westward to Steyning, Shipley, Nuthurst, returning by way of Rusper into Kent, or they might have taken the reverse of the order mentioned. But such an assumption is improbable, as we here have a military levy summoned in the usual manner.

From a statement of the Grey Friars' Chronicle it would seem that Cade also visited Maidstone, a city 23 miles east southeast of London, and Tunbridge, which lies between Maidstone and Sevenoaks, 30 miles southeast of the capital. "Jake Cade fledde and removyd fro thens toward Tunbrych, Maydstone and Senoke."[3] But it is certain that he could not

---

1 Privy Council VI, 97.

2 Yet Mr. Cooper (Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 17) maintains that the men Sussex did not join Cade till he had entered London.

3 Grey Friars Chr. 19.

have visited them before the battle of Sevenoaks. For he left Blackheath in the night of June 17, and the battle was fought on the 18th.[1] But he may well have touched Tunbridge and Maidstone after the battle, either before or after the Sussex manœuvre. What makes this more probable is Payn's complaint that the rebels burnt his house in Kent.[2] We know from his pardon that his home was in Peckham, a town near the mainroad from Maidstone to Tunbridge.[3]

The men of Surrey who accompanied Cade, probably joined him between June 18 and July 1. Hall evidently thought that they did not join him till after the battle of Sevenoaks.[4] But we have no postive testimony of his having marched through that county in order to recruit. Mr. Cooper believes that neither the men of Surrey nor those of Sussex joined till after the rebels had arrived in London.[5] But this opinion is certainly untenable.

As long as the royal army kept together, the rebels preferred to let them alone. But on news of the dispersion of the king's soldiers,[6] Cade probably communicated with the captain of Essex. A march on London was arranged and on 1 July[7] the Kentishmen reached their old camp at Blackheath.

---

1 Maidstone is 23 miles away from London, and from there to Sevenoaks is 17 miles.

2 Past. Letters I, 134. Whether they really burnt it or not is an open question.

3 Ib. cxlvi.

4 Hall 220.

5 Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 17.

6 Quum iste maleficus Johannes Cade *agnovit dispersionem dominorum* et controversiam in populo, multo majorem audaciam resurgendi arripuit. Chr. ed. Giles 40. The Engl. Chr. indeed states that Cade did not advance on Southwark until he had heard that the king had left London. But it was not the king whom the rebels feared, it was his army. They would have asked nothing better than a chance to get possession of his person.

7 Appendix, p. 129.

Their second stay lasted only one day. Nevertheless, their captain found time to behead one of his undercaptains, named Parys, who had committed some breach of discipline.[1] He also received two ambassadors, the archbishop of Canterbury and the duke of Buckingham. The king had probably appointed them to treat with the captain, but they certainly did not succeed in bringing him to terms. They found him wise and discreet in his commoning.[2]

On the next day, 2 July,[3] the men of Kent and Sussex marched on London. They arrived at Southwark, on the south side of the Thames, in the afternoon. On the same day the commons of Essex arrived at Mile End, but neither they nor their Kentish comrades could gain admittance into the city. So both armies camped where they were and the captain of Kent took lodgings at an inn in Southwark called the White Hart.[4]

It has been the prevailing opinion that the majority of the council of London was favourable to the rebels. We are told that it was through a resolution of the aldermen that they gained admission into the city. But if this were the case, why did they not admit them on 2 July? A notice in the Cotton MS. throws considerable light on Cade's relation to

---

[1] At Sevenoaks he had in like manner beheaded a squire called Stanlaw. Grey Friars' Chr. 19.

[2] These incidents are related by all three followers of the Lost Lond. Chr., who agree almost verbally.

[3] Appendix, p. 129.

[4] Payn here relates how he dissuaded the rebels from burning Fastolf's house in Southwark, by treating them, it would seem. 'It coste me more than vi marks in mate and dynke.' Then he tells us how the captain despoiled his room in the house, and carefully sums up all the articles he lost (Paston Letters I, 134) But if Cade here plundered his follower Payn, I do not see why he spared the goods of the 'grettist traytor that was in Yngelond or in Fraunce'.

the city council. "Vpon the morne[1] the comons of the cite wente vnto Guildhall by a sommance made by a commyssionn which was sent from the kyng to certeynn lordes and to the mayr and dyvers justices, to enquere of all persons that were traitors, extorcioners or oppressors of the kynges people." [2]

Henry VI had at last agreed to the demands of the nation. His favourites were to be brought to justice, and this was to be done in a way most flattering to London. The mayor was to be one of the judges,[3] and the aldermen were summoned to take part in the judicial proceedings. Would these same men have acted in opposition to the king's commands? He had just granted them all, even more than they had desired. How would this correspond with the loyal professions they made him when he wished to leave for Kenilworth?

On Friday, July 3, the commission began it's sessions in the Guildhall. But when all were assembled the king's justices were nowhere to be found. The citizens were full of wrath,[4] but the commission resolved not to be thwarted. Robert Danvers was made justiciary, and court commenced. The duke and duchess of Suffolk, the bishop of Salisbury, Thomas Danyell, John Say and many others were indicted of treason.[5]

---

1 I. e. the day after the rebels arrived at Southwark, in reality July 3.

2 Vit. 107a.

3 It is not known who the others were. Perhaps the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishop of Winchester and the duke of Buckingham were among them. The three prelates were certainly in London during the rebellion. It is very likely that some one of the chief justices was employed in so important an affair.

4 Vit. 107a: But the justices wolde not be founde, wherfor the citizens were right evyll content.

5 Worcester 471. The fact that Suffolk and the bishop were dead, did not prevent their being indicted. Their property was not formally forfeited until they were convicted by a proper tribunal,

According to the Cotton MS. alderman Philip Malpas was deprived of his office on that same day. But Mr. Orrige, from researches a mong the Guildhall records, informs us that it really occurred on June 26.[1] At any rate, it is certain that an important session of the city council occurred on July 3, after the court was over. We owe our knowledge of the occurence to Fabyan. The session was called by the mayor 'for to purvey ye wythstandyng of thyse rebellys'. But the aldermen themselves were of diverse opinions. Some were even in favour of admitting the rebels into the city. A violent discussion arose. One of the members of the court party, Robert Horne, stockfishmonger, used such violent language against his opponents[2] that the council committed him to ward. But Fabyan does not say that the council then and there decided to admit the rebels into the city.[3] We have positive testimony to the contrary. Cade *forced* his way into London in the afternoon of that same day, Friday, July 3.[4] According to the so-called Gregory a bloody conflict took place on London bridge. Of course this is an exaggeration, but we always find some fact at the basis of this author's exaggerations. All the other authorities who describe the entrance confirm this supposition.[5]

---

1 Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion, p. 3. Malpas had been sheriff in 1439-40 and member of parliament in 1441. In 1449 the city council had been forced to elect him alderman, on the recommendation of court.

2 Not for speaking against the rebels, as has been universally maintained. Horne was probably committed to ward for using offensive language in council.

3 This has been the accepted opinion. Gairdner, Paston Letters I, liii, Stevens' Dict. VIII, 172, Pauli V, 309.

4 Compare appendix, p. 129.

5 They faught sore a manly and many a man was mortheryde and kylde in that conflycte, Gregory 191. Vit. says that the 'capteyne came into the cite *per force*'. *Vi* et armatis London ingreditur, Worcester 471. Civitatem *violenter* intraverunt, Hist. Croyland. 526.

We do not know who let down the drawbridge for them. Perhaps it was the populace, which favoured the rebellion. The English Chronicle tells us that the rebels entered 'be favour of some of the men of Londoun.' They certainly met with some resistance, possibly from the guards of the bridge. But it was too late; the rebels were already on the drawbridge. They cut the tows that drew it up. London was at their mercy.

At St. Magnus,[1] just by the bridge, the captain of Kent made a proclamation, forbidding robbery, on pain of death. He caused it to be repeated in various parts of the city, first at Leadenhall.[1] The rebels went there immediately after they entered the city[2] to settle accounts with Malpas, who lived in Cornhill. It is very possible that the latter had had something to do with the resistance they met on the bridge.[3] They paid him with interest for his bad will. His house was rifled from top to bottom; every thing the rebels got their hands on was taken.[4] Malpas would have been ruined, had he not taken the precaution to remove his most valuable possessions before-hand.[5]

After this diversion the rebels marched in great state through the city. Their captain rode at the head in a lordly fashion. His gown was of blue velvet, his shield was studded with gold nails, his spurs were of gold. A naked sword was in his hand. Before him marched Poynings, his swordbearer,

---

1 Vit. 107 b.

2 Appendix, p. 130.

3 Grey Friars Chr. afterwards relates that Malpas drew the chain of the drawbridge. Now the ropes were cut at the time of the battle of London bridge. It is possible that the chronicler may refer to some part taken by Malpas in resisting Cade's entrance.

4 Gregory 191-2.

5 Fabyan 624.

carrying his sword of state.[1] The keys of the great city were delivered into his hands to make his glory complete.[2]

A curious incident which occurred during this procession is related by the copyists of the Lost London Chronicle.[3] It serves well to show what this authority throught of Cade. When the train was passing through Canwick street, the captain dismounted from his horse, advanced to the old London stone and struck it violently with his sword. "Now is Mortymer lord of this city," were the proud words he attered.

After having spoken with the lord mayor about the disposal of his men, he returned with most of them to Southwark. His people were allowed to leave and enter London at all lawful hours.[4] Part of them took up quarters in the city. Aided by their London friends, they are said to have searched all night with great ardor.[5] We are not told what they were hunting. Probably some of the king's favourites, who lay concealed there.[6]

The next morning the main body of the Kentishmen returned and the work of reform was pushed forward with energy. In the Guildhall the royal commission began it's work. Inquests were summoned and several of the court party arraigned.[7] The rebels also determined to administer justice after their own fashion. They took their hated sheriff Crowmer from

---

1 Eng. Chr. 66. His clothes and armour had been taken from Sir Humphrey after the battle of Sevenoaks. Compare the description given by all three copyists of our lost authority.

2 Ib. 66. Compare the statement of the brief Latin Chronicle published by Mr. Gairdner, Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 151, cui tradite erant claves civitatis London per majorem et vice comites at aldermannos.

3 It is given by all three, and has become well kownthrough Fabyan.

4 Fabyan 624.

5 Gregory 191.

6 Many courtiers afterwards put in their appearance to help fight against the rebels.

7 Gregory 191. Vit. 107b, he (i. e. Saye) was enditid *with other* of treasonn.

the Fleet and led him to the camp of the men of Essex. There they beheaded him without any further trial in the presence of their captain. At the same time the camp at Mile End witnessed the execution of a rebel called Baily,[1] who was beheaded at Whitechapel.

We now come to consider two accusations against the captain, which have hitherto been accepted unchallenged. After the executions at Mile End Cade is said to have dined in Tower street with a citizen named Gherstis, and to have robbed him as soon as he had finished eating. Instead of having Horne and several others tried, he is accused of having been bribed to release theim.

Both of these accusations can be traced back to statements of the Lost London Chronicle.[2] The case of Gherstis is not related by any of the others. But this is just what makes the matter suspicious. All were hostile to the captain, and scarcely any forget to tell how he spoiled Malpas. Why should they neglect a much more obnoxious event? The captain of Kent, without any other cause than a desire to rob, plunders a friend, with whom he had just dined! All his other acts of violence had a purely political character.[3]

---

1 He was a native of Colchester in Essex (Grey Friars' Chr. 19). Worcester and Fabyan say that he was executed as a necromancer. Both state that he was an old friend of Cade's, and Fabyan relates the circumstances of his execution very exactly. When Cade saw him coming towards him, he feared that Baily would reveal how great am impostor and rascal he was. He knew that his old comrade had magical implements with him. So he accused him of being a magician, his men searched him, found the suspected apparatus, and beheaded him as an enchanter. — Fabyan himself acknowledges that he had this from hearsay. In truth, it sounds very much like a current legend.

2 The former is related by all three copyists, the latter by Vit. and Fabyan.

3 For instance, the spoiling of Malpas or his wanting to burn Fastolf's house at Southwark (if he really did). There is no warrant for Furley's statement, that the Kentishmen plundered the shops and houses of London. Weald of Kent II, I, 35.

They fall in the same line with the burning of John of Gaunt's palace by the infuriated populace in 1381. I should think that Cade was too politic to rob a friend without any further cause. Perhaps Gherstis belonged to his political adversaries.

The case of Horn is somewhat different. Fabyan relates the circumstances very exactly. Cade intended to bring him before the justices, 'but his wyfe and frendes made to hym suche instaunt labour, that fynally for v C marke he was sette at lybertye'. This does not necessarily say that they bribed him with 500 marks, and that Cade thereupon unlawfully released him. It may mean that he was fined so much, or that this was the price of his bail. For our best London authority says that Horne actually was brought before the justices and committed to Newgate prison.[1] The Cotton Manuscript also states that he was tried in the Guildhall and *there* saved through the efforts of his friends.[2] It simply relates us a part of the proceedings of the court. Several of the accused escaped the death sentence and were fined instead. Among these was Robert Horne, who owed his life to his wife and friends. If Cade reaped such goodly sums of money, what became of them? The possessions of him and all the other ringleaders together only contained £ 105 15 *s.* cash. What would the Kentish population, the gentry, the middle classes and the peasants have said to such an undisguised robbery and bribery? The had come with the good, honest intention of removing these very evils.

---

1 Gregory 192. Dyvers questys were i-sompnyd at the Gylhalle; and *ther* Robert Horne beyinge alderman was a-restyde and brought in to Newegate.

2 After relating how Cade had brought Say to the Guildhall to be indicted with others of treason, it states that he also 'sent for Robert Horne aldermann, wher (i e. in the Guildhall) with grete labours of his ffrendes he scapid with his life, and was raunsomed at a grete somm of money. And so were other delt with in like maner'.

In the afternoon[1] of Saturday, July 4, the rebels took the lord treasurer out of the tower and conducted him to the Guildhall.[2] Many charges of treason were proffered against him,[3] but Say would not acknowledge the competence of the commission to try him and demanded a trial by his peers. The proceedings lasted too long for the Kentishmen. It was already evening, and they were afraid that juristical chicanery would enable the culprit to escape. So they took justice in their own hands and snatched him away from the officers.

They rushed him to the Standard in Cheapside, and ere the priest had had time to confess him, there beheaded him without any more ado. It was already seven o' clock in the evening.[4]

The corpse was fastened to a horse's tail and thus dragged to the captain's inn at Southwark.[5] There it was quartered before the church of St. Thomas. The severed head was carried through the streets of London on a long pole. Crowmer's head was treated in the same way and both were made kiss each other. At length they were planted on London bridge with the head of Baily of Colchester placed at their side.[6] Such proceedings may seem very shocking to a modern reader, but in the 15th century it was no uncommon occurrence to come across heads and limbs of traitors on one's morning walk.

---

1 Appendix, pp. 130-1.

2 It was the duty of the commandant of the tower to deliver him to the royal commission.

3 According to Gregory he confessed himself guilty of Gloucester's murder. Nonsense! Gloucester probably died a natural death. This is a fair sample of many of the rumors which this chronicler wrote down.

4 Caxton, ch. 26.

5 Eng. Chr. 67.

6 It seems to have been customary to treat the heads of criminals in this manner. Tyler's men also did thus.

These two victims of the popular fury were both Kentishmen, and very nearly related. Crowmer had married Say's daughter. Both seem to have been kindred souls in regard to extortions and oppressions. The office of treasurer was indeed no light task in such bankrupt times, but Say seems to have managed it very badly. Crowmer was indeed a great oppressor, but he was no worse than most of colleagues. Oppressions by the sheriffs were the rule in those days.

But these were not all the executions that took place on 4 July.[1] In the evening, after the captain had returned to Southwark, he found it necessary to execute another adherent, William Hawardine, a Londoner of the parish of St. Martins.[2] This man must have been a rather hard character, to judge from the testimony of our authorities.[3]

On the following day, Sunday, July 5, the rebels remained at Southwark.[4] A squire named Thomas Mayne, a native of Hampton in Surrey, was there beheaded.[5] This might indeed indicate that a spirit of insubordination had broken out among them, which prevented Cade from returning to London.[6] But it seems that their army was still in good condition. The following night found them well prepared. I believe that Cade did not return because he mistrusted the Londoners and was afraid to scatter his men throughout the city.

If he did, he was certainly right. The council was doing it's best to get rid of him. Modern historians make a mistake

---

1 Gregory 193, Fabyan 625, Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas 136. Worcester says on the following day and gives Smithfield as the place of execution.

2 Grey Friars Chr. 19.

3 Gregory calls him a 'strong theff', Worcester a 'communis latro'. The Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas insists that he was 'a menquéller' as well.

4 It is curious that London was in Cade's and Tyler's possession the same length of time, three days.

5 Gregory 193.

6 As has been remarked by Mr. Gairdner in Stephens' Dict. VIII, 173.

when they assume that it was favourable to the rebels until they began to rob.[1] This is indeed the view taken by several of our authorities.[2] But we have already seen that they show us no robbery, which was not a political measure, perpetrated on a party, whom the majority of the council hated worse than the rebels did. We know that the council tried to keep the king in London with them. We remember that Cade had to force his way into London and cut the ropes of the draw-bridge, because he feared that the council might attempt to exclude him. We have seen how the rebels set at nought the court in the Guildhall, in which the mayor and aldermen sat.

The true state of affairs is only to be read between the lines of our authorities. The chronicle edited by Mr. Gilles says that the council secretly planned to resist Cade, 'quia *totum vulgus* eum favebat, et igitur timuerunt cum eo pugnare in die'.[3] The Lost London Chronicle relates that the poor joined Cade, because he robbed.[4] The reason given is false, but it is none the less true that the lower classes were heart and soul with the rebels. The populace was for them, but the aristocratic council was not. It was precisely as in 1381, when the poor artizans in London opened the gates to the rebels, and when Walworth, the lord mayor, struck down their leader in the presence of the king. Thomas Chalton, the mayor in 1450, seems to have been of the same political opinion as his predecessor in 1381. It was he, who called a council to provide means for withstanding the insurgents. It was he, who afterwards took the lead against them.

---

1 This is the universal opinion.

2 Especially of the Lost Lond. Chr. All three of it's copyists dilate on this point. The poor helped Cade to rob, the rich began to fear for their property.

3 P. 41.

4 Given by Vit., Caxton and Fabyan, and already well known through the latter.

As long as Cade was in possession of the city, there was nothing to be done but to submit. But as soon as he was absent, they were against him. Of course, the violent confiscations made by the rebels caused them fear for their own goods. I do not deny that there were radical members, who like Cooke openly favoured them. But the majority of these civic aristocrats ever held themselves aloof.

They began to negotiate with the garrison of the tower. Lord Scales, who had been left in command, was willing to aid them and sent a detachment of his garrison. Several of the courtiers immediatly put in their appearance. The royal archers of Fleetstreet arrived.[1] All of these were joined with such forces as the city could raise and placed under Scales and Mathew Gough.[2] The Londoners seem to have fought under their mayor.

That very evening[3] they fell on such rebels as had unsuspectingly remained in the city.[4] The Kentishmen immediately retired into Southwark, and the Londoners, following, occupied the whole bridge. But the rebels were soon upon them, and beat them furiously back over the bridge.[5] The Londoners rallied. They pressed the enemy so hard, that their captain was compelled to throw open the prisons of Southwark. The prisoners of the king's bench and the Marshalsea were freed and sallied forth to aid the captain.[6]

---

1 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 151, statim venerunt plures de curialibus et Fletestrete architenentes. (From the brief notes in MS. Lambeth 488). These architenentes were also called 'archers of the city' and were royal troops. Three 15 Cent. Chrs. 71.

2 Gregory 193. Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas 139.

3 According to Gregory at 8 o'clock, according to the Eng. Chr. at 9.

4 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 68, Eng. Chr. 67.

5 Caxton, ch. 26, the Kentishmen . . . gate the brydge, and made them of London to flee and slowe many of hem.

6 Gregory 193, before that tyme (i. e. before he burnt the drawbridge) he breke bothe kyngys bynche ande the Marchelsy. This event did not occur after the battle, as has usually been supposed, for instance in Paston Lett. I, lv.

So the battle raged undecided. Gough saw the valor of the enemy and advised his friends not to pass the drawbridge.[1] But they did not heed his words, and pressed the enemy to the Surrey side. All at once they heard flames crackling behind them. The drawbridge was burning.[2] The captain of Kent had fired it. The Kentishmen plied their sabres on the remnant, which the flames separated from their friends. The battle was ended.[3]

It had lasted the greater part of the night. Our best London authority maintains that it did not cease till 8 o' clock next morning.[4] I think it very likely that the drawbridge was burnt at this time. The hand to hand encounter must then have ceased, as the combatants could no longer get at one another.[5]

The losses are said to have been heavy on both sides, but the citizens seem to have suffered most severely, thanks to the calamity of the drawbridge. Mathew Gough, one of their leaders, perished in the flames.[6] He was a gallant

---

1 This is one of the bits of new information given us by Hall, p. 222.

2 Some of the houses of the drawbridge probably caught fire. The later chroniclers accuse Cade of having fired them.

3 This skyrmysh *endurid til the brigge of tre* was set on fire betwene them of Kent and Londoun. Eng. Chr. 67.

At the last they brent the drawe brigge, Vit. 108b.

At laste the capteyne fired the drawe brigge. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 68.

And *than* (i. e. Monday, 9 o'clock, when the battle ceased) the capitayne fired the drawbrigge. Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas 136.

4 Viz. Gregory. The three copyists of the lost Lond. Chr., Three 15th Cent. Chrs. and the Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas say that is lasted till 9 o'clock, the Eng. Chr. till 10.

5 Modern historians, following the statements of the chroniclers, have neglected to consider this fact. They let the drawbridge burn and the battle keep on raging.

6 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 151. Capitaneus et qui cum eo erant combusserunt pontem London, unde plures erant submersi et interfecti ex utra parte, inter quos quidam nobilis Matheus Goo interfectus erat.

Welsh squire, who had had great experience in the French wars. John Sutton, an alderman, and Roger Heysande, a citizen, were also among the slain.

On the morning of July 6 several members of the royal council came to negotiate with the combatants. We hear of the archbishops of York and Canterbury, of the bishops of London and Winchester.[1] Through their mediation all further hostilities ceased.[2] After having crossed over into Southwark, they treated with the captain and his adherents in St. Margaret's. The articles of the rebels were accepted, a general pardon was granted to all, and the rebels agreed to return home. But not because 'they were disgusted with their leader, and alarmed at the result of their own acts.'[3] They went because the representatives of the council now received the demands,[4] which they at first so proudly spurned. It is probable that they made the rebels promises about acting upon them. And as the latter had been morally beaten in battle and were permanently shut out of London, they gladly accepted these terms.

On the same day[5] a pardon was drawn up for the captain of Kent.[6] The next entry on the patent roll containing the list of the pardoned rebels, is not dated. It contains pardons to the esquires William Tyrrell jr., Mathyew Hay and John Batell, Richard Shodewell, gent., Roger Wycke of Colchester and Richard Stace sen. for treason at several places

---

1 The chancellor (York) had been in the tower; Winchester had been concealed at Holywell, to the north of London. Hall's Chr. 222.

2 Gregory 193. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 68, Chr. ed. Giles 41.

3 Gairdner, Paston Letters I, lv. This is the universal opinion of historians.

4 Worcester 472, ibidem receperunt billas peticionis ejusdem.

5 I. e. the 6th. Arch. Cant. VIII, 239.

6 Published by Mr. Cooper in Orrige's Illustrations, p. 82.

in Essex, Middlesex and London.[1] The pardons for these men were probably issued on 6 July. It is very likely that we have here to do with the ringleaders of the Essex movement. Four other pardons are dated July 6, those to John Robynson, William Bygge, Simon Morley and John Swayn of the city of Canterbury.[2] Perhaps these too were persons of influence among the rebels.

The rest received pardons on the day following. On 8 July,[3] after all was finished, the rebels returned home. The greater part of the Kentishmen returned in a body to Rochester, where they arrived on 9 July. Their captain was still at the head. According to a good contemporary authority, he was afraid and kept them in a body.[4] It is possible that the treason, of which his act of attainder[5] accuses him, consisted in this.[6] He is accused of repeated treasons, at Southwark on 8 July, at Dartford on the 9th, at Rochester on the 9th, 10th and 11th. But the proclamation for his arrest distinctly maintains that he inflamed the people. He is said to have urged that their pardons were of no avail without the consent of parliament.[7]

The captain's subsequent conduct was such as to justify the assertion. With such rebels as still remained faithful he

---

1 Sussex Arch. Coll. XVIII, 36.

2 Arch. Cant. VII, 239.

3 Appendix, p. 131. Hall's picture of their joy at being pardoned is a fair sample of his vivid imagination.

4 Johannes timens suam turbam in multitudine retinebat, quousque ad Rochestre provenerunt. Chr. ed. Giles 41.

5 Rot. Parl. V, 224.

6 As has been surmised by Sir James Mackintosh, Hist. of Engl., Lond. 1831, Vol. II, 14.

7 Stowe 637. Probably reminding them of the conduct of the parliament after Tyler's rebellion, which refused to ratify Richard II's promises.

made an attack on Queensborough castle[1] on July 10, the day after they arrived at Rochester. He probably hoped to surprise the fortress, but did not succeed. Sir Roger Chamberlain, the commander, beat the rebels back, and took two of them, Geoffry Kechyn and a captain called Boucher, prisoners.[2]

We do not know the captain's object in attacking the castle. Perhaps he had been invited by the mayor of Queensborough, who belonged to his adherents. At any rate, there was no other course left for him than to remain a rebel. His pardon had been drawn up under a false name and had no value.[3] Besides there were legal subtleties enough for ridding the king of so troublesome a subject. On 10 July he was publicly cried a traitor under the name of Cade.[4] The proclamation accuses him of being a murderer, a robber and a traitor to the French, and then goes on to tell how he had disturbed the peace after his pardon. Whosoever should bring him to the king, dead or alive, is promised 1000 marks for his pains.[5] Five marks are set on the head of every traitor, who should accompany him from that day

---

1 On the isle of Sheppy, not far from Rochester.

2 For these he was promised a reward of 40 marks. Issue Rolls 471. Strange statements have been made about this attack. Mr. Green says that Cade's troops were composed of the gaolers of the king's bench and the Marshalsea (Hist. of Eng. People I, 136). Mr. Cooper maintains that the garrison was composed of one man (Arch. Cant. VII, 242).

3 As was conjectured by Mr. Gairdner. His conjecture was verified by Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 68.

4 Gregory says that it was proclaimed in London on the 12th (p. 194). Three 15th Cent. Chrs. state that this occurred in all the shires on that date. But the original document is dated July 10. I think that in so important a case it must have made known directly after it was written.

5 Gregory adds that 500 marks were set on the head of every other ringleader. We hear nothing of this in the original document. It must be a mistake. Even such a favourite as the duke of Somerset received only £ 40 for the capture of an insurgent leader.

forth.[1] The officers of the shire[2] are forbidden, on pain of death, to execute any of his commandments, and are commanded to arrest any one bearing them.

In the meanwhile the captain had returned to Rochester. On 11 July he was still there, engaged in some kind of treason or other.[3] On that day the quarrel over the booty occurred, about which Worcester tells us. The profits of the rebellion had been shipped down the Thames on a barge.[4] According to the Chronicle ed. Giles, Cade wished to put them on board of a ship, but his comrades were not agreed, and a quarrel ensued.[5] Soon after he took to horse and fled, but hardly on account of the quarrel. It is more likely that the arrival of sheriff Iden and his posse caused his flight.[6] This would account for his not having passed directly over from Kent to France. He had many friends among the seamen.

On 12 July[7] he was overtaken by Iden at Heafeld, near

---

1 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. give 10 marks for every adherent. The document is to be preferred.

2 The chronicle just mentioned says that it was proclaimed in every shire. Stowe does not tell as to whom it was addressed. But an order of the privy council states that it was proclaimed in London and in Kent. Rymer V, II, 27.

3 Rot. Parl. V, 224.

4 Eng. Chr. 67.

5 Ibidem (Rochester) voluit sua spolia ad navem deduxisse, sed quidam de suis hoc non affirmantes cum eo litigabant.

6 I think that Iden was sheriff at the time. Worcester, the Eng. Chr. and the Chr. ed. Giles say that he was, but Shakespeare makes his appointment the result of his having killed Cade. It has been said that the time from Crowmer's death, July 4 till 13, when Cade's dead body was at London, will not suffice. For during this time Iden must have been appointed, pursued Cade into Sussex, and have brought his dead body to London. (Stephen's Dict. VIII, 174, Furley II, I, 397-8). But why could Iden not have been appointed on the 8th, 9th, or 10th, have pursued Cade to Rochester on the 11th and have taken him on 12 July?

7 Appendix, p. 131.

Lewes, in the weald of Sussex.[1] One of his own adherents is said to have betrayed him to the pursuers.[2] They came upon him in a garden,[3] and a desperate struggle ensued, in which the captain of Kent was mortally wounded. His naked, bleeding body was placed on a hurdle and hurried through the cold night towards London.[4] The poor wretch died on the way.[5]

On the next day the corpse was identified by the hostess of the White Hart at Southwark. Then it was taken to the king's bench prison, where it remained exposed until the following Thursday. There it was beheaded and quartered.[6] The bloody pieces were placed on a cart and drawn through Southwark and London to Newgate, that all might gaze on the captain of Kent. The head was placed on London bridge;

---

1 An issue roll of 21 Oct. 1450 grants John Davy £ 20 for services in the taking of Mortymer at '*Hefeld*' in Sussex. The Eng. Chr. distinctly corroborates this, 'in the *wode cuntre beside Lewes*'. Gregory says 'in the welde in the countre of Sowsex'. Vit., Fabyan and Caxton let it occur in a garden in Sussex; Nicolas' Lond. Chr. simply says in Sussex. This is testimony enough on the subject. There is really a village near Lewes called *Heafield*. And yet most modern historians have followed local tradition. Some of them say that the capture occurred at Heathfield in Sussex, which possesses a Cade street and the ruins of a Cade castle. Even Mr. Gairdner has given this legend the preference (Stephens' Dict. VIII, 173). Mr. Cooper has also accepted it (Arch. Cant. VII, 243). But the testimony of the issue roll is incontrovertible. Moreover Heathfield is not 'beside Lewes'. Another legend place Cade's capture at Hothfield in Kent. Three 15th Cent. Chrs. and Grey Friars' Chr. also let it occur in Kent, but mention no place. All of these will be found in Furley's Weald of Kent II, I, 386-96.

2 Gascoigne, Liber Veritatum, p. 19.

3 Worcester 472.

4 Dr. Pauli thus relates the circumstances of Cades death: "In einem Garten zu *Heyfield* wurde er (Iden) seiner habhaft und liess ihn auf der Steile töten" (V, 311). Neither the events related nor the place mentioned are to be found in the authorities.

5 Three 15th Cent Chrs. 68. Eng. Chr. 68.

6 Gregory (194) is to be preferred to Vit. and Fabyan, who say that Cade was beheaded at Newgate. The former was an eye-witness.

the quarters were sent to the rebellious towns of Blackheath, Norwich, Salisbury and Gloucester.[1]

Who was the captain of Kent? We do not even know his name. The royal documents invariably call him Mortymer until after his pardon. He was first called Cade and termed an Irishman in the proclamation for his arrest. It states that he had lived with Sir Thomas Dacre at Heathfield. A year before that time[2] he had there murdered a woman with child, and had therefore been compelled to take sanctuary and flee to France, where he became a traitor to his king.

The improbability of these assertions is patent enough. Would the men of Heathfield have followed a man, whom they knew to be a murderer?[3] How could Sir Thomas have suffered such society about his premises? From 10 July the state papers call the captain Mortymer and Cade indiscriminately.[4] In the first act of attainder his name is Cade.[5] But in the arraignement, which followed this act, the court calls him 'Mr. John Aylemere, ffysyssion; and he was gayly to be seyn in skarlet, and wedded a squier dowghter of Taundede'.[6]

The royal authorities evidently did not know whom they accused. For in an act of attainder passed two years later, he is again called Cade.[7] Nor did the chroniclers know any

---

1 Privy Council VI, 107.

2 Not a year before the rebellion, as has been assumed by Mr. Gairdner. He slew the woman 'the last yeere *tofore* his dwelling . . . with Dacre'. Stowe 637.

3 A strong contingent from the neighborhood took part in the rebellion. Suss. Arch. Coll. 18.

4 He is called Mortymer in the Proc. of Privy Council VI, 97, 98, 108.

5 Rot. Parl. V, 224.

6 Ellis, Orig. Letters, 2nd ser., I, 112. Mr. Gairdner accepts this statement and also the assertions of the proclamation as undisputed facts. He thus obtains materials for a brief life of Cade. Stephens' Dic. VIII, 171.

7 Rot. Parl. V, 265.

thing about him. When they call him Cade, an Irishman, they simply tell what people learned from the proclamation. The only one who was an eye-witness gives him no name at all, until he mentions the fact, that the captain was proclaimed a traitor under the name of Cade. Payn, who certainly came in contact with him, alway calls him the captain, never Cade.

About his character our authorities know even less. Gregory calls him 'that sory and sympylle and rebellyus captayne';[1] Worcester takes him for a worthless adventurer.[2] The English Chronicle says that he was a 'ribaude' (ribald), but also calls him 'sotill man'.[3] The Lost London Chronicle comes nearer the truth. It states that the king's ambassadors found him wise in council, but believes that he did not mean well.[4] All the authorities were his enemies. Especially are the royal documents full of tender expressions for him. 'The moost abhominable tiraunt, horrible, odious and erraunt fals traitor' or 'horrible, wikked and heynous traytour and tiraunt'.[5]

I think that we are safe in assuming only one thing of the captain. He must have been a man of some military experience, if not ability.[6] It was no small task to keep such a motly army disciplined and ready for fight as long as he did. But even his military movements are too little known to enable us to estimate his ability. Beyond this we can know

---

1 P. 192.

2 He says that Cade was 'de una arte' with Baily.

3 Pp. 64-5.

4 Vit. 108 a and the other copyists.

5 Rot. Parl. V, 265-396.

6 Mr. Gairdner has remarked, that Cade 'besides some experience in war, was evidently possessed of no small talent for generalship'. Paston Letters I, lii.

nothing about him.[1] Gascoigne indeed states that he was a young man at the time of the rebellion. But the good divine was not in a position to know much outside of his theology. Hall calls him 'a certayn young man of a goodely statue and pregnaunt wit'; but this statement, like his other assertions about Cade, belongs to his phantasies.[2]

As for Cade's political plunderings, they by no means prove that he was a 'villian at heart'. They were no crimes in the eyes of the 15th century. All the goods he had taken were in turn robbed by the government. The thought of returning them to the true owners never entered the minds of the king's officers.

Soon after the dispersion of the rebels the king returned to London. On 10 July he was at Westminster and signed the proclamation for Cade's arrest. On the 11th order was restored in London. The heads of Say and Crowmer were taken down from the bridge and their bodies peacefully interred at Grey Friars.[3] On 12 July Thomas Tyrrell, knt, and Richard Waller, esq., were sent to Rochester to take

---

1 Mr. Cooper has assumed that Cade was not the lowborn person he is generally supposed to be (Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 35). The 1st act of attainder says: 'Howebe it thaugh he be dede and myscheved, yet by the lawe of youre seid londe not punyshed', be it ordained that he forfeit to the king 'all his goodes, londes, tenementes, rentes and possessions... and his blode corrupted and disabled for ever' (Rot. Parl. V, 224). The only further punishment that could be inflicted on a dead traitor, would indeed be the confiscation of his property. But I think that we here have to do with a formular expression. The 'goodes, londes' ect. is legal terminology, calculated to embrace all kinds of property, which any person might possess. The blood of every traitor was corrupted, whether he was of gentle blood or not. And when the act states that Cade had not been punished according to law, it probably means that he had not been executed.

2 Hall 220. Yet it has been accepted by many historians. Pauli V, 307.

3 Gregory 193-4.

charge of the possessions of the captain of Kent.[1] On the 14th the treasurer was ordered to receive them, on the 18th to pay Tyrrell, Waller and all those who were with them for their costs and trouble.[2]

I presume that the quarrel between Cade and his friends about the booty was interrupted by the arrival of Iden, coming in pursuit of Cade. At any rate, their property was captured by emissaries of the king. Tyrrel and Waller found £ 105 15 *s.* cash, and other valuables which realized the sum of £ 274 8 *s.* 4 *d.*[3] The only recompense which the rightful owners were allowed for their losses, was the privilege of buying back their property for less than it's real value.[4] On 29 August poor Malpas thus expended £ 114 9 *s.* 4 *d.* in recovering his own.[5] The duke of York alone formed an exception to this rule. He owned some of the jewels taken from Malpas, and on 6 October following the exchequer paid him £ 86 7 *s.*, the sum which they had realized.[6] A measure of the privy council also authorized the treasury to pay Cade's captors 1000 marks out of the proceeds of the booty.[7]

On 1 August measures were taken to stop the disorder in Kent. A commission was issued to bring to trial all such as had remained in arms after the pardon, but with functions for Kent only. It was composed of sixteen members. Among these we find the chancellor, the archbishop of Canterbury,

---

1 Privy Council VI, 97.

2 Ib. 98. They were afterwarde payed £ 5 13 *s.* 6 *d.* The payment is dated 30 June, 1450, probably a mistake for 30 July.

3 Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 32-3.

4 Rymer V, II, 27.

5 Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 33.

6 Issue Rolls 467.

7 Rymer V, II, 27. There exists an issue roll (p. 467) granting them £ 266 13*s.* 4*d.*

Buckingham and Ralph Boteler. Two of the chief justices were employed, John Prisot of the common pleas and Peter Ardern, chief baron of the exchequer. Of the others, justice Yelverton of the king's bench is well known from the Paston Letters. Our old acquaintance Robert Danvers was made judge of the common pleas on August 14, 1450,[1] and also sat on this commission.[2]

No record has been preserved of the activity of this court. We hear of no executions occurring afterwards. But it did not succeed in quieting Kent. On 31 August a new revolt occurred at Faversham. 400 men assembled under a smith named William Parmynter,[3] who assumed the title of the second captain of Kent. They claimed that 40 000 men of like opinions were ready to take up arms in Kent.[4] But unfortunately these warriors did not put in their appearance. The smith was taken prisoner and committed to the care of an esquire of the duke of Somerset, named Thomas Waryn.[5] In the Hilary term of the next year he was brought to trial.[6]

---

1 Past. Letters I, 139, n. 5.

2 Fortescue's name is not on the list of the commissioners, which has been published in Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 34. Mr. Plummer urged that he was on the commission, and cites the following passage from a letter of Aug. 19. to prove his statement: "The chief justice is not here ne non other justice, except Danvers is now made judge of the comune place, and is forth into Kent with the lords" (Paston Letters I, 139). But the words 'is forth into Kent' certainly refer to Danvers, not to Fortescue, as Mr. Plummer thinks (Fortescue, Gov. of Engl. introd. 50). The word 'except' is here used as a conjunction in the sease of only, not as a preposition.

3 Also called Parneman, Issue Rolls 472.

4 Our knowledge of the movement is derived from a pardon to James God, one of the participants. Paston Letters I, cxlvi-ij.

5 Issue Rolls 472. Waryn received his reward on Aug. 5., 1451, not 1450, as Mr. Gairdner states. (Past. Lett. I, lvi.) There can therefore be no false date here.

6 Past. Lett. I, cxlvii.

An energetic man succeeded Northumberland as constable of England. It was no other than the duke of Somerset, who had just returned from France. He was appointed at Rochester on 11 September.[1] During this month he succeeded in taking a third captain of Kent, named John Smyth, for which he was awarded £ 40 at London, October 3.[5] But Kent was so unquiet that he soon had to return. On 29 October he was paid £ 200 of his salary in advance and again sent into Kent. For every day thus employed the constable received 20 marks. Sheriff Iden aided him, and was lucky enough to capture Robert Spenser, a sworn brother to Mortymer.[2]

On 20 September[3] the duke of York returned from Ireland and marched on London with a retinue of 4000 men. In vain did the court lords try to stop him; in vain did they waylay the friends hurrying to his assistance. Henry was utterly unable to withstand him. He yielded to all his demands. He promised to form a new council, and a parliament was called for November 6. At the opening of the session the chancellor distinctly stated that one of it's main purposes must be to quiet the country and to punish the rebels.[4] But the parliament was Yorkist and sympathized with them. It was much more bent on punishing the courtiers. The London populace attacked the lodgings of the duke of Somerset, who narrowly escaped being killed. It took the united exertions of the king and the Yorkist lords to preserve order.

When a commission finally was sent into Kent and Sussex, York himself was a member. His friend lord Bourchier took part, but Sir John Fastolf was a member too. It was

---

1 Rymer V, II, 25.

2 Privy Council VI, 101.

3 Worcester 473.

4 Rot. Parl. V, 210.

issued in December 1450.[1] The rebels do not seem to have fared badly under it's treatment. It's activity certainly did not come up to the wishes of the court.

For on 2 February a commission was sent into Kent formed on quite different principles. This time the king went himself, and such man as Exeter, Somerset and Shrewsbury[2] accompanied him. At Canterbury they held sessions four days, and eight men were beheaded. At Rochester nine were put to death, and in this fashion the commission passed through the rebellious districts of Kent and Sussex into the west country. They certainly held sessions at Salisbury.[3] Many people were executed on this circuit. At a single time twelve heads were brought to London and no less than 23 heads stood on the bridge at once.[4] In Kent men called it the harvest of heads.[5] We are not told whether the leaders of the great rising were then punished, or whether the commission confined itself to disturbances following the pardons.[6] The former must certainly have been the case in Salisbury, for no pardons had as yet been granted there.

At length, in the session of parliament which began on 5 May, an act of attainder was passed against the captain of Kent.[7] But the king also had to promise to remove several of the obnoxious favourites from his presence.[8] All of them,

---

1 Past Lett. I, 186, n. 1.

2 These were afterwards Lancestrian partizans. Eng. Chr. 97, 108.

3 Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 69.

4 Caxton, ch. 26.

5 Gregory 197.

6 We owe most of our information on the subject to Gregory, who does not say. Fabyan 625-6 and the other copyists of our lost authority evidently refer to this commission. For it was the only one in which the king himself took part. Besides, we hear of no men being judged to death before this time.

7 Rot. Parl. V, 224.

8 b. 216.

along with the captain of Kent, were indicted on 10 and 15 August, 1451.[1] Two years later, in the parliament at Reading, it was thought necessary to repeat Cade's act of attainder, couched in much stronger terms.[2] In the troublous times which followed Kent ever remained restless. Especially did Cade's swordbearer Poynings distinguish himself. But his attempted riots, interesting as they are, no longer come under the head of the rising of 1450.

---

[1] Ellis, Orig. Letters, 2nd ser. 'I, 112' gives us a list of those indicted. Rot. Parl. V, 265.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARACTER OF THE RISING OF 1450 AS COMPARED WITH THAT OF 1381. — PART OF THE YORKISTS.

I counted the names of the pardoned rebels published by Mr. Cooper and found 2232 altogether. Of these 1819, the great majority, were from Kent. There were one knight, John Cheyne of Eastchurch, in the isle of Sheppey, 18 esquires and 74 gentlemen. There were 205 yeomen, 33 merchants, 215 craftsmen, 330 husbandmen and 41 ship and boatmen. Of the clergy we find 5 priests, 2 clerks and 2 holywater-clerks. 54 constables and the mayor of Queensborough appeared to represent the official world; 720 names are given, without any trade being mentioned.[1]

These figures certainly verify the investigations of Messrs. Gairdner and Cooper. The movement was by no means of a distinctly plebeian or disorderly character, but was a general and organized rising of the people at large. In 27 of the hundreds of Kent we find the regular military levy

---

[1] My computation makes no claim to great accuracy. The names of the men are sometimes mentioned twice. Especially is this the case with the constables of Sussex.

under the constables; in some of them there are as many men under arms as could be found there at the present time.[1] Moreover, it was a rising of the whole people. All classes except the nobility are represented. Mr. Gairdner even maintains that the greater part of the gentry took part.[2]

In Sussex the rising partook of the same character. There two very influential nobles, the abbot of Battle and the prior of Lewes, openly favoured the rebels. Besides these I found 14 gentlemen, 116 yeomen, 8 merchants, 23 craftsmen, 81 labourers, and 18 without any trade at all. Two bailiffs and 44 constables are mentioned, besides two clerks and a chaplain. 413 names are enumerated altogether.

Here we find the agricultural interests taking a more important part than in Kent, although they also take the predominant part there. An unusually large number of small freeholders followed Cade in Sussex; the yeomen constitute more than 25 per cent of all the names mentioned. It is also worthy of remark that 22 of the hundreds sent in their regular military levy.

Now I do not deny that there were evils, which affected the different classes separately. The right of purveyance bore heavily upon the agricultural classes, whereas the decline of maritime traffic was most keenly felt by the seamen. But the main grievances were such as affected the whole population.

How different from the rising in 1381! That was an outbreak of the lower classes against the upper. Not only the nobility, but the higher clergy, gentry, civic aristocrats and upper middle classes were oppressors, — all those, who

---

1 Arch. Cant. VII, 237.

2 Stephens Dic. VIII, 171. Unfortunately we have no means of ascertaining the population of Kent in 1450.

sat in parliament, who ruled the land. The villains and small freeholders were arrayed against the landlords, who held them down, the poorer artisans against the rich burghers. Class was arrayed against class. It was the first great conflict between labour and capital in England. It was a social strife. The bondmen demanded to be free forever; the freedmen, that oppressive laws cease to molest them.

The rising of 1450, on the other hand, was a political upheaval. Nearly all the demands of the insurgents were political. They arose against the domination of one political party in favour of another. And the rebels did not constitute any particular class of the nation. Squires, gentlemen, yeomen, artisans, labourers, — all arose together. It was a rising drawn from the whole people, whereas the outbreak in 1381 was a class rising. There was absolutely no agitation against the upper classes as such. We find no trace of socialism or democracy in 1450.

Nor do we find a single demand for religious reform.[1] Gascoigne made a great mistake in assigning so important a part to the demoralization of the clergy. Neither in the chronicles nor in any of the other sources of information do we find a word on ecclesiastical grievances. The rising was directed against the clergy only in so far as the bad governors of the realm belonged to it's numbers.[2] Moleyns and Ascough were slain, not because they were bad bishops, but because they belonged to the king's hated advisors. On the contrary, we even find an abbot, an abbess and a prior, be-

---

1 As has been remarked by Green, Short History, p. 282.

2 The rising was not directed mainly against, the clergy, as Dr. Pauli claims that Gascoigne said. The passage quoted certainly says nothing of the kind. (Engl. Gesch. V, 313, n. 4.)

sides several of the clergy, implicated in the rising. The former would have been an eyesore to religious reformers. Modern criticism tends more and more to dispel the notion, that the popular outbreaks of those days were connected with religious ideas. We know that such was not the case in 1381.[1]

In other respects the rising of 1450 bears little resemblance to the great upheaval which preceded it. As a political movement, its character was milder than that of a social outbreak. It was much less radical. The outbreak of 1381 was directed against the existing law and order. The rebels beheaded a jury, chased away a royal judge and slew all the lawyers they could find; 'not until all these were killed would the land enjoy it's old freedom.'[2] But Cade's men had no fault to find with the laws. Their complaint was that the king's favourites continually broke them and urged him to do likewise.

The former had no scruples about breaking the law. Their first act was to open the Marshalsea prison and release all the prisoners. They killed all the Flemings and Lombards they came across. Wat Tyler was thought to have said that he would dictate the laws of England. The latter were less violent. Their captain contented himself with extorting money from the strangers and only released the prisoners, when hard pressed in battle.

The first movement bears more resemblance to the Jacquerie, to the risings of the German peasants; the second is more like

---

1 It has been proved that Wycliffe had nothing to do with the rising. On the contrary, the insurgents favoured the begging friars, who were his opponents, and cordially hated his patron, John of Lancaster. Compare Lechler's Wiclif I, 656-65, Pauli, Westminster Review 1854, VI, p. 170.

2 Green, Short History, p. 253.

the rising of the commons of the north under Robin of Redesdale 19 years later. It's leader was as unknown and mysterious a character as the captain of Kent. The articles of the men of the north enumerate the public evils, which vexed the Kentishmen;[1] their demands are the very same. They too desire the restoration of the lords of the royal blood and the punishment of malicious counsellors. No social evils were at work, no new laws are demanded in 1469. Bad governance was the chief curse. Public grievances were mainly political, precisely as in 1450.

Since the rising of 1450 was political, what was it's relation to the political parties of the time? The answer is given us by the documents of the captain of Kent. These demand the recall of York and the banishment of Suffolk's party from the royal presence. In fact they are so much like the demands made by the Yorkist lords in 1460, that learned men have confounded them.[2] Moreover, Kent and Sussex, the counties which were most rebellious, were afterwards devotedly Yorkist. When York needed aid in 1452, he marched into Kent. Only the Lancastrian north was free from the rising.

The ringleaders, as far as we can ascertain, were partisans of York. According to Mr. Cooper the squires of Sussex were ardent Yorkists later on.[3] Poynings, the only conspirator about whom we possess any exact information, was a violent adherent of the duke. In 1460 we find him high in favour with the earls of March, Warwick and Salisbury.[4] He was finally killed fighting on York's side just

---

[1] Compare their articles, Warkwork's Chr. 45-51.

[2] For instance Sharon Turner, who took Cade's proclamation for York's articles. The latter are to be found in Stowe's Annales, p. 166.

[3] Suss. Arch. Coll. XVIII, 18.

[4] Past. Letters I, 526.

before the second battle of St. Albans.[1] After the pardon for his part in Cade's rebellion he stirred up riot after riot, but always managed to escape without serious punishment.[2] Would this have been possible, if there had been no powerful persons backing him?

Let us examine the position of the duke of York. He had two distinct claims to the throne. Should Henry VI die childless, he would succeed through his grandfather, Edmund of Langley, a younger brother of Henry's grandfather. His second claim was from his mother, who was descended from an elder brother of John of Gaunt. Her father had been acknowledged by Richard II as his heir. Her brother had ever been the hope of the discontented lords under the first Lancastrian kings. Duke Richard's father had been beheaded for trying to place him on the throne. What was the position of the Kentishmen in regard to these claims?

Their captain called himself Mortymer. All the people took him to be a member of a house, which had always sought to hold aloft it's claims by force. By following a Mortymer they too held aloft that claim. Their leaders not only advocated that York be restored to his legitimate place in the council, but emphasized his superior right to the throne.

They even dared to do this openly. Gregory (p. 196) says: "There were dampnyde many men of the captayne . . . for hyr talking agayne the kyng, havyng more favyr unto the duke of York thenne unto the kynge." And in view of this fact a statement made in Richard's attainder[3] does not

---

1 An inq. post mortem 9th and 10th Edw. VI, no. 9, gives the date of this battle as that of his death (Past. Letters II, 329). A letter written by his widow refers to his having gone to that battle (Ib. 330). Worcester (p. 486) says that Edward Poynings was killed at Dunstable just before the battle, but probably means Robert, as Mr. Gairdner has remarked (Gregory xxv.)

2 Rot. Parl. V, 247-8; Past. Letters I, 294, 344.

3 Rot. Parl. V, 346.

seem at all improbable. It is there stated that several of the ringleaders before their execution confessed that their purpose had been to make York king.

The words of king Henry himself give us clear and unmistakable insight into the feelings of the rebels. Directly after the rebellion York came over from Ireland and sent him a bill. He wished to exculpate himself from charges of treason preferred against him in several county courts, and complained that the king's officers had everywhere striven to arrest his progress. In his answer Henry tells him very plainly why this had been done.[1] The rebels, who killed Moleyns, had spoken 'against our estate' and had threatened the king with utterances imputed to York himself: "That ye should be fetched with many thowsands, and ye should take upon you that which ye neither ought, nor, as we doubt not, ye will not attempt." These words can refer to nothing else than to the deposition of Heny himself.

Several of the insurgents even went so far as to threaten the king to his face.[2] Throughout the country such sayings were uttered. For this reason he had sent instruction to his adherents to retard York's progress, if he came in a war-like manner. On this account the duke had been indicted of treason in several county courts.

Of course, York was much too wise to have uttered the threats imputed to him. But the rebels certainly thought that he did. Mortymer's men hoped that the duke would soon come to aid his cousin. Who knows what they would have done, had Henry VI fallen into their hands? Why should they have shuddered at a radical change? They always were the

---

[1] Stowe has preserved us both these bills. They have been published in a convenient form in Gairdner's Paston Lett. I, lx-lxi.

[2] So far forth that it was said to our person by divers, and especially we remember of one Wasnes which had like words unto us,

most radical of their countrymen. But they were not the only Englishmen who would liked to have seen York on the throne. In the next session of parliament that followed the rebellion, Young, a member for Bristol, moved that he should be made heir to the crown. According to a good authority, all the commons agreed to this proposition.[1] This motion was an anticipation of what really occurred in 1460, when the heirs of Henry VI were formally excluded. What does it matter if Cade's proclamation does deny that the commons wished to depose the king and to put York on the throne? The declarations of York and Warwick were just as loyal, when these lords came over from France in 1460. When Edward IV came from Burgundy to reconquer England, his first move was to profess loyalty to Henry VI.

The question then arises, whether the duke himself incited the rebellion. Was Cade one of his emissaries? We have not sufficient evidence to answer the question satisfactorily. The fact that Cade took some of York's property which was in deposit in Malpas' house, does not prove that he was in no communication with him.[2] In the tumult of the spoiling Cade hardly had time to investigate the ownership of the various articles.

It might be urged that York afterwards got himself put on a commission to try the Kentish and Sussex rebels, and that he probably treated them leniently. The king himself was afterwards compelled to go into Kent in order that justice be meted out properly. But it might also be maintained that York got himself appointed to prove his loyalty. Even if he did openly favour them, — does this fact prove that he instigated the revolt? The Lancanstrians believed him to be the chief instigator, when the act of attainder was passed against

1 Lond. Chr. ed Nicolas 137.
2 This was urged by Pauli, Engl. Gesch. V, 312.

him. He, as well as his devoted adherent Sir William Oldhall, were accused of having been partizans of Cade.[1] But this does not prove their guilt.

It may be asked why York did not return directly from Ireland to take advantage of the rebellion, if he really stirred it up. Why did he wait till September 20? Perhaps, because he did not dare to take part with the rebels openly. By such an act he would have lost the support of the lords. It may have been just as in Robin of Redesdale's day, when no one knew who the leader was. Warwick and Clarence took no open part in the rising, and yet it is certain that they stirred up the strife. We know very well that they planned Edward IV's deposition, and that Clarence would have become king, had they succeeded.

Although the rebels in Kent, Sussex and Essex were so devotedly Yorkist, the rest of the country was not yet ripe for such changes as Kent would have accepted. I believe that most of the other rebels, like the nation at large, were still for Lancaster. Nor do I maintain that the men of the southeast arose with the set idea of deposing Henry VI. But I certainly do think that they would have welcomed any change, however radical, which would have freed them from the existing evils. A far stronger cause than loyalty or party feeling drove them to revolt. Public misery stirred them up. Just as they arose against Lancaster in 1450, they rebelled against York in 1472 under the bastard Fauconbridge. However this may be, the commons in 1450 arose against Lancaster and in favour of York. Their rising was the first great struggle in the wars of the roses.[2] It was a fit beginning to that mighty convulsion.

---

[1] Rot. Parl. V, 265, 346.

[2] Compare Fortn. Review, new series, VIII, 455.

APPENDIX.

CHRONOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

The rebellion began in Whitsuntide week. Worcester, whose dates are very reliable says, 'Septima in Pentecoste incepit communis insurrectio in Kancia'. He may mean 'septima *die* in Pentecoste', May 30, the 7th day in Whitsuntide, or 'septimana in Pentecoste', during the week following Whitsunday, May 24-30.[1]

In order to compute the remaining dates, we shall use the date of the battle of Sevenoaks as a starting point. For we know from the testimony of an inquisitio post mortem 28 Henry VI, no. 7,[2] that Humphrey Stafford was killed on 18 June. Worcester says that it occurred on a Thursday, and June 18 was a Thursday.

It is also certain that the king's army pursuing Cade arrived at Blackheath on the same day. Worcester says, 'Ante nonam diei Jovis dominus rex . . . intravit dictum campum de Blakheath', and afterwards remarks that the battle of Sevenoaks occurred on the same day that the king reached Blackheath. We also know that the king had set out from his camp against them in the morning of 18 June. The

---

1 Compare Worcester 469, n. 5. The Engl. Chr. 64 also says that the rebellion began in May, and on p. 68 it remarks that the tyranny of the captain lasted from May 31 till July 6. Fabyan states that the commons assembled in June, but he probably copied carelessly. A comparison with Vit. will show that the original authority stated, that the rebels came to Blackheath in June.

2 Cited by Mr. Gairdner, Past. Lett. I, liii, n. 3.

Cotton Manuscript states that 'the king on the xviii day of the said moneth adressed his people toward theym'[1] (i. e. the rebels ot Blackheath). Three 15th Century Chronicles assert that 'the xviii day of June the kynge toke his wey toward the Blacke Hethe'.[2] Lastly, Gregory declares that the king's army marched through London the morning after the rebels retired. We shall presently see that they retired during the night of the 17-18 June.

In fact, there is no use to assume with Caxton that the king left his camp on June 17. If he set out early, he could easily have reached Blackheath by nine o'clock. Clerkinwall, where the king camped, is now a part of London, and Blackheath is only 5 miles distant. It is very likely that Caxton miscopied the Lost London Chronicle, as the Cotton MS. gives us the proper date. He also states that the king arrived at Blackheath on 'the xvii daye of Juny', which is evidently a copyist's error for xviii.[3]

The advance of the king's army certainly took place on 18 June. Accordingly, the rebels must have retired in the night of 17-18 June. For Three 15 Century Chronicles and the English Chronicle maintain that they drew back the night before the king advanced; Worcester and Giles' Chronicle, on the night before the king designed to attack them. We know from Worcester himself that June 18 was the day set for the battle.[4] It is indeed true, that among some memoranda of

---

[1] Vit. 106 b.

[2] P. 67.

[3] Mr. Gairdner thinks that Heury advanced on Thursday, June 11, because Worcester states that he decided to attack on Thursday (Past. Lett. I, lii). But the latter evidently refers to Thursday, June 18, when the attack was really made. He afterwards speaks of the 18th as 'eodem die Jovis', which he had mentioned above.

[4] Dominus rex diem Jovis in propria persona assignavit ad pugnandum cum eis. Worc. 470.

the events of 1450-52, in his own handwriting, we find, 'Jak Cade, proditor de Kent fugit de la Blakheth xxii die Junii'.[1] But this is evidently a copyist's error for 'xvii die Junii'.

The proclamation made by the king, ordering the rebels to quit the field, must have been made on 17 June. Gregory, who relates the incident, says that the rebels withdrew the night after it was made. And it is probable that the council ordered it to be cried out and decided to attack the rebels on the same 17 June. The two preceeding days, June 15 and 16, were occupied by the negotiations with Cade.[2] Now the king, as we shall presently see, arrived on the 13th. I presume that the 14th was spent in the 'maturiori consilio dominorum' mentioned in Giles' Chronicle.

We have already seen that the rebels retired in the night following 17 June. Accordingly, they must have arrived on the 10th or 11th. Our lost London[3] and the Grey Friars' Chronicles, two authorities quite independent of each other, state that they held their camp seven days. Moreover, we know from the Cotton Manuscript that the commons 'came downe to Blak Heth in Jun'. Worcester says that they arrived in June, but gives no date. He intended to add it afterwards.[4]

The king's army must have arrived at London on 13 June, the Saturday after the rebels reached Blackheath. Worcester's 'die Saboti *sequente*' refers to the Saturday following

---

1 Past. Lett. I, 123.

2 Chr. ed. Giles 39. Sed ejus maturiori consilio dominorum in refutatione effusionis suorum sanguinis legiorum, prius satagunt cum praefato Joanne de pace et concordia tractari, et eundem ad gratiam postulandam a regia majestate inclinare, et sic cum ipso per duos dies certi domini tractabant. Et quum nollet eis obedire, *die tertio . . . putabant* domini in campa manu forti pugnare.

3 Vit. 106b, Fabyan 623.

4 Mr. Gairdner, in all his publications, assumes that they arrived on June 1, and so does Mr. Cooper (Arch. Cant. VII, 240). The latter claims to have followed Worcester.

the arrival of the rebels at Blackheath, and cannot possibly refer to the Saturday following the beginning of the rebellion.[1] If we assume with Messrs. Gairdner and Cooper that the Kentishmen arrived on June 1, and the king on the 6th, we should encounter a chronological difficulty. The rebellion broke out during the Whitsuntide holidays, perhaps May 30. The news had to go from Kent to Leicester, the king to collect an army of 10000 men, and then to make a march of nearly a hundred miles over bad mediaeval roads to London. This would have been well nigh impossible by June 6. Moreover, we should have to account for a space of 12 days, June 6-18, during which the king's army lay quietly at Clerkinwall. But what makes this hypothesis clearly impossible, is the fact, that the king's army was not assembled till June 7.[2] Worcester cannot have meant any other day than June 13.

The above investigations give us the following chronological scheme:

May 24-30 or May 30.	Beginning of the rebellion.
On or soon after June 7.	The king begins his march.
June 10 or 11.	Arrival of the Kentishmen at Blackheath.
„ 13.	Arrival of the king at London.
„ 14.	Deliberations of the council.
„ 15-16.	Negotiations with Cade.
„ 17.	The king's proclamation.
„ 17 (midnight).	Cade's flight.
„ 18.	Battle of Sevenoaks.

[1] Et . . . . die Junii communitas Kanciae . . . . venerunt usque Blakheath et ibi fixerunt campum. Et die Saboti sequente dominus rex venit Londoniam.

[2] Fabyan 622. The kyng . . . by the vii daye of Juny had gaderid to hym a stronge hoost of people to go agayne hys rebellys.

It is also neccessary to refute a series of chronological errors, which our lost London authority made. For through Fabyan they found entrance into all later chronicles and have thus become the accepted basis of the chronology of Cade's rebellion. All modern historians have adopted them.

In the first place, it is stated that Cade returned to Blackheath on St. Peter's day, June 29, and remained there till July 1. But the so-called Gregory,[1] who was an eye-witness, says that he did not return to Blackheath till Juli 1, and the London Chronicle ed. Nicolas[2] says distinctly that it was 'after Seint Petres day'.

Secondly, our lost authority dated the occurrences of Thursday, Friday and Saturday, July 2, 3 and 4, one day too soon. Cade arrived at Southwark on the 2nd, not on 1 July.[3] Gregory states this distinctly and even Vitellius and Fabyan are agreed to the fact, that it occurred on the day before Cade entered London. Now the entrance certainly took place in the afternoon[4] of Friday, July 3. Six authorities, all independent of each other, maintain this.[5] True, the English Chronicle ed. Davies here agrees with the lost authority, and gives us Thursday, July 2, as the date of Cade's entrance. But unlike it's companion, it dates the occurrences of Saturday, July 4, properly, thus losing a day, Friday, the 3rd. We have already taken occasion to note how confused the chronology of this authority is.

---

1 P. 191.

2 P. 136.

3 On the same day the commons of Essex arrived at Mile End. Vit. 107 a, Fabyan 623.

4 All authorities are agreed to the fact that it was in the afternoon. Vit. and Fabyan give the exact time, 5 p. m.

5 Gregory 193, Worcester 471, Three 15th Cent. Chrs. 67, Lond. Chr. ed. Nicolas 136, Grey Friars Chr. 19. Caxton here followed some other source than Vit. and Fabyan. He gives us the proper date, July 3.

I also place the session of the royal commission on the 3rd, following Worcester. The Cotton Manuscript states that it occurred on the same day that Cade entered London.[1] Malpas was plundered directly after Cade passed the bridge, not on the day following, as our lost authority believed. Gregory[2] says, 'In that furynys they wente . . *strayght* unto a marchaunte ys place i-namyd Phylyppe Malpas'. Three 15 Century Chronicles,[3] that 'as sone as thei entred London they rubbed Phelipe Malpas'. Worcester (p. 471), the English Chronicle (p. 66) and Nicolas' London Chronicle (p. 136) maintain the same.

The occurrences of Saturday, July 4, are in like manner placed on Friday. And as those of Sunday are properly dated, a day, viz. Saturday itself, is not accounted for. Fabyan indeed observed this omission and sought to remedy matters by assigning the plundering of Gherstis to 4 July. According to the order in which all our authorities describe Crowmer's execution, it would seem that it occurred in the morning of July 4. Baily was executed at the same time. Fabyan distinctly maintains this.[4]

According to the Cotton Manuscript, Horne was also tried in the morning, and Gregory is agreed to this statement. But Say certainly suffered death in the afternoon, not in the morning, as all three copyists of the lost authority seem to think, to judge from the order in which they relate the event. In Three 15th Century Chronicles we find it distinctly stated that he was not fetched from the tower till in the afternoon. Gregory tells

---

1 Dr. Pauli says on the day following, but as he assumes with Fabyan that Cade entered on 2 July, he comes by chance to give the proper date, July 3 (Geschichte V, 310).

2 P. 191.

3 P. 67.

us that he was beheaded 'the same day aftyr-non', and Worcester gives the exact time, 7 o'clock.[1]

The events of 5 and 6 July are properly dated by all except Worcester and Fabyan,[2] who say that the rebels returned home on July 6. But we know from Cooper's patent roll that most of them were not pardoned till the 7th. Cade's attainder[3] states that he was engaged in treasons at Southwark on 8 July, in Dartford on the 9th, in Rochester on the 9th, 10th and 11th, and as the main body remained with Cade,[4] they cannot have left Southwark before 8 July, or have arrived at Rochester before the afternoon or evening the 9th.[5] On the 10th the attack on Queensborough castle was probably made, and on the 11th Cade fled from Rochester. On July 12 Cade was slain at Heathfield. Three 15th Century Chronicles indeed say on the 13th, but Gregory, who gives the 12th, probably saw the corpse in London on 13 July.[6] No further chronological difficulties occur.

---

1 P. 471.

2 P. 625.

3 Rot. Parl. V. 224.

4 Abowe, p. 104, n. 4.

5 They were in Dartford on the same day, 17 miles distant from Rochester.

6 Compare his account, p. 174.